




# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THURSDAY, 24th FEBRUARY, 1938.  
Vol. II—No. 2

## OFFICIAL REPORT



### CONTENTS

	PAGES.
Starred Questions and Answers. . . . .	1073—1101
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1101—1104
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Molestation of an Indian Girl and Firing on Rescuers by European Soldiers in Muttra District— Postponed to next day . . . . .	1104
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	1104—1156
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	1104—1119
Failure to completely Indianise the Railway Services and the Railway Board . . . . .	1104—1119
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works—	1120—1143
Manufacture of Locomotives in India . . . . .	1120—1143
Demand No. 6-F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments—	1143—1152
Stores Department . . . . .	1143—1152

P. T. O.

	PAGES.
Demand No. 6-B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power—	1152—1153
Disregard of certain Recommendations of the Pope Committee . . . . .	1152—1153
Demand No. 1—Railway Board . . . . .	1153
Demand No. 2—Audit . . . . .	1153
Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure . . . . .	1153
Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and Companies	1153
Demand No. 6-A—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works . . . . .	1154
Demand No. 6-B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power . . . . .	1154
Demand No. 6-C—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock . . . . .	1154
Demand No. 6-D—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours . . . . .	1154
Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department . . . . .	1154
Demand No. 6-F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments . . . . .	1155
Demand No. 6-G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses . . . . .	1155
Demand No. 6-H—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department . . . . .	1155
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund . . . . .	1155
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges . . . . .	1155
Demand No. 11—New Construction . . . . .	1156
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works. . . . .	1156

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Thursday, 24th February, 1938.*

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

## STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### (a) ORAL ANSWERS.

#### REDUCTION OF POSTAGE RATE BETWEEN BURMA AND INDIA.

466. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state:

- (a) whether Government have received any reply from the Government of Burma to their representation to reduce the postal rates between India and Buma; and
- (b) if so, what is the nature of their reply?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

#### AIR-CONDITIONED CARRIAGES ON RAILWAYS.

467. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state:

- (a) on how many railways air-conditioned carriages are running;
- (b) whether that carriage has been found by experience to be convenient and healthy; and
- (c) whether Government propose to extend its use to the lower class passengers also and, if so, when?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) On the Great Indian Peninsula, East Indian and Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railways.

(b) Government have every reason to believe that the comfort which air-conditioned coaches afford has been generally appreciated. They have received no complaints from the point of view of the health of the passengers.

(c) As indicated last year by my predecessor in his speech during the general debate on the Budget, an essential criterion in the extension of the scope of this experiment to lower class passengers is its commercial success. We are examining the possibilities, but before arriving at any decision it is obviously prudent to await further data in regard to the experiment we are now making than its brief period of operation hitherto has been able to afford.



**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Has it been a commercial success from the experience gained till now?"

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Sir, the experience is too short to justify any final conclusion as to success or failure.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** With regard to (b), are Government aware that the corridor in these air-conditioned trains is so small that a man like my friend, Maulana Shaukat Ali, or my friend, Mr. K. Ahmed, if he wished to get in, could not physically get in?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I await a complaint from the gentlemen mentioned.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Have Government in mind any programme for extending it to other Railways in the higher classes?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have no doubt that if this experiment proves a success, it will be extended to other railways.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** With reference to the answer to part (b), may I know the percentage of utilisation of the seats,—this is to say, whether all the seats are being utilised, all the time?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I should require notice of that question.

#### AMALGAMATION OF RAILWAYS AND ABOLITION OF ADVERTISING OFFICE IN NEW YORK.

468. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state:

- (a) whether Government have considered the matter of amalgamations of Railways;
- (b) whether Government have considered the matter of the abolition of their advertising office in New York; and
- (c) if so, what steps they have taken in the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to paragraph 11 of the Report and paragraph 27 of the Proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee which met in July and August last and also to Appendix VIII of the Committee's printed report Vol. I, Part II—Railways. The question is under further examination.

(b) and (c). It has been decided to close down the New York Publicity Office.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** When do they expect to come to a conclusion on the matter referred to in part (a)?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** If the Honourable Member would read the reference I have made in part (a) he will see what considerations are which govern this question.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Do Government propose to use some of the staff which will be made available in this manner by the abolition of the New York Bureau?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That, Sir, is a hypothetical question.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** I am asking whether the staff which was working hitherto in New York and which will be released by the abolition of the Bureau is proposed to be used for the Trade Commissioner's office which is being established in New York, instead of men being called from London?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I am informed that it is not proposed to utilise that staff for the office of the High Commissioner.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** What will happen to that staff?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I must ask for notice of that question.

#### DEATH OF ONE AMIR CHAND IN THE KARACHI RAILWAY HOSPITAL.

469. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Has the attention of the Honourable Member for Railways been drawn to an article appearing in the *Railway Herald*, Karachi, dated the 24th September, 1936, regarding one Amir Chand who died in Karachi Railway Hospital due to neglect and wrong treatment by one of the doctors in September, 1936?

(b) Is it a fact that the widow of this Railway employee has appealed repeatedly for enquiries in the matter without any success?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply questions Nos 469 and 470 together.

Government have seen the articles referred to by the Honourable Member. These are matters within the competence of the Agent, North Western Railway, to whom I am sending a copy of the questions for such action as he may consider necessary.

**Maulana Zafar Ali Khan:** What steps are being taken to provide for the widow of the man who died?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have said that I am directing the attention of the Agent of the Railway to this matter, and he, no doubt, will take what action is considered proper.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the reply of the Agent in this matter be placed on the table of the House?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Mohanlal Saksena:** Will you also inquire whether any action is proposed to be taken about the doctor concerned?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have already explained what our attitude is in regard to matters in which I draw the attention of the Agents of the Railways to matters which are within their own competence.

**CHARGE MADE FOR VISION EXAMINATION FROM ONE SHER ALI BY A DOCTOR OF THE KARACHI RAILWAY HOSPITAL.**

†470. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Has the attention of the Honourable Member for Railways been drawn to an article in the *Railway Herald*, Karachi, dated the 24th September, 1936, about a Railway employee, Sher Ali by name, who on his vision examination was charged Rs. 40 by one of the Railway doctors of the Karachi Railway Hospital to be passed on to the District Medical Officer?

(b) Was any action taken in the matter to stop recurrence of such acts?

**RECRUITMENTS FOR THE BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT**

471. \***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications please state

- (a) the number and names of posts in the Broadcasting Department which are at present included in the list of posts to which recruitment is made by the Public Service Commission,
- (b) the posts to which recruitment is made by the Controller of Broadcasting himself;
- (c) the number of posts to which recruitment is made or it is proposed to make in consultation with Selection Committees;
- (d) how these Selection Committees are constituted;
- (e) whether Governments in provinces where radio stations are situated or will be situated are consulted or will be consulted regarding the Selection Committees which are intended to recruit candidates for those stations; and
- (f) whether Government propose to consider the desirability of so constituting the Selection Committees as to ensure that a majority of the members are non-officials?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a), (b) and (c) A statement giving the required information is laid on the table of the House.

(d) The selection committees are constituted by the Government of India. The Controller of Broadcasting is Chairman, and they include two Station Directors, or the Chief Engineer and one Station Engineer; when technical staff have to be selected, and two or more non-officials

(e) This is done whenever practicable

(f) I can give no such undertaking

---

*Statement.*

(a) Number and names of posts to which recruitment is made through the Federal Public Service Commission.

*Office of the Controller of Broadcasting—*

6 Assistants

5 Clerks II Division.

15 Clerks III Division.

---

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No 469

*Central News Organisation—*

- 1 Editor.
- 1 Sub-Editor

*Indian Listener—*

- 1 Editor.

*Broadcasting Station, etc*

- \* 9 Station Directors
- \* 3 Assistant Station Directors
- \* 9 Station Engineers
- 8 Directors of Programmes.
- 17 Assistant Station Engineers

\* Recruitment to these is at present made by promotion after consultation with the Federal Public Service Commission.

(b) Posts to which recruitment is made by the Controller of Broadcasting himself

- Draftsmen
- Stenographers
- Announcers
- Mechanics.
- Telephone Attendants.

(Clerks at different stations of All-India Radio.

(c) Posts to which recruitment is made through Selection Committees

*Broadcasting Stations, etc.—*

- 32 Programme Assistants.
- 47 Technical Assistants.
- 20 Probationers

---

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Has any committee been constituted for Lucknow?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** So far as I am aware, no selections have been made and no selection committee has been utilised for Lucknow.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Are these selection committees appointed for any particular period or for certain occasions?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** In Delhi I believe there is something in the nature of a standing committee and in the case of Madras where selections were recently made or are now being made, the selection of the committee was *ad hoc*.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will any professors of the universities of Allahabad and Lucknow be nominated to the Selection Board?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** When the question arises, we shall consider what should be the composition of the Lucknow Committee.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will the Honourable Member take that into consideration?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Most certainly, Sir.

## AIR-CONDITIONED CARRIAGES ON RAILWAYS.

472. \***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) which are the areas in India in which air-conditioned coaches are in use;
- (b) whether it is proposed to introduce them in other areas, and if so where;
- (c) what are the conditions which should be satisfied before the introduction of these coaches in any one area can be considered;
- (d) whether these coaches are available for second class passengers; and
- (e) what is the cost of a coach which is now in use?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) and (b) Five air-conditioned coaches are in use on the Bombay-Calcutta Mail Service and one on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Frontier Mail between Bombay and Delhi. A scheme has been formulated for a modest extension of the latter service from Delhi to Kalka.

(c) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to my reply today to part (c) of starred question No. 467.

(d) No.

(e) The cost of each of the coaches in use on the Bombay-Calcutta service is Rs. 95,000. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, however, the air-conditioning equipment was installed in one of their existing coaches. The cost of the equipment was approximately Rs. 9,000.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Has the demand for first class reservation gone up since the introduction of these air-conditioned coaches?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** When the experiment has reached a further stage, I shall be able to give an answer to the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** What is the percentage of the first class passengers using these air-conditioned coaches?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of that

**Mr. N. V. Gadgil:** Is there any proposal to extend this to third class passengers also?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That has already been dealt with. Next question.

## OFFICERS IN THE RAILWAY BOARD.

473. \***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) what was the total number of officers in the Railway Board in April, 1936, and in April, 1937;

- (b) what was the effect of retrenchment in 1932 on the number; and
- (c) whether the number has since increased. and if so, by how many and why?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) sixteen and eighteen respectively.

(b) The number was reduced from nineteen to fourteen.

(c) Yes by four found to be necessary in order to handle the volume of work to be done.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Has the total number of men other than officers decreased during this period?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I am not able to say with any certainty. My impression is that it has not, but if the Honourable Member will give notice, I will give him fuller and more correct information.

#### ABOLITION OF THE FIRST CLASS CARRIAGES ON STATE RAILWAYS.

474. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Wedgewood Committee \* has recommended the abolition of the first class carriages in State Railways as a measure of economy;
- (b) what action Government propose to take on that recommendation; and
- (c) whether Government are prepared to abandon further air-conditioning of railway coaches?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) and (b). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to paragraphs 71 and 72 of the Wedgewood Committee's Report and page 5 of the "Statement showing the action taken by the Railway Board on the paragraphs in Chapters III to XI of the Committee's Report", a copy of which is already in his possession.

(c) The air-conditioning of Railway coaches is still in the experimental stage. Present indications are that their provision is likely to prove remunerative on certain services.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** How soon do Government expect to give effect to the recommendation in regard to the abolition of the first class and having only second class?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That, Sir, is a question that does not arise out of the answer I have given.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** I submit that it does because the Wedgewood Committee has suggested the abolition of the first class coaches on State Railways as a matter of economy, and I wish to know how soon Government expect to give effect to this recommendation of the Wedgewood Committee?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I refer the Honourable Member to my reply to parts (a) and (b) of the question.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** In that portion of the report that they have submitted they have not stated anything at all in regard to part (c). I want to know when Government expect to give effect to this recommendation?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** The problem involves reference to the various Railway Administrations and I can give no reply until we have had the views of the Administrations concerned.

**Seth Govind Das:** Have the Government asked the different Railways about their views in this matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Certainly.

**Seth Govind Das:** When do they expect to come to a conclusion?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I cannot say until I get the replies from the various Railway Administrations.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Why is it that the Government of India have not consulted the Railway Conference Association at its last meeting which took place after the Wedgwood Committee had made this recommendation?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Because this is not necessarily a problem that is common to all Administrations. The problems of the Administrations vary in this respect according to the circumstances of the Railways that they administer.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** In view of the recommendation of the Wedgwood Committee, will the Government stop building further air-conditioned coaches?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** There is no definite policy of air-conditioning. What is going on at the present moment is an experiment. The results of the experiment may dictate that the whole policy be dropped.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Has any estimate been made of the economy in terms of money by the abolition of first class, large parts of it really go empty?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** No, Sir. The estimate can only be formed when we have the necessary information from the Railways who have been consulted.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Have the Government definitely taken this matter into consideration as to what economy would result from the entire abolition of first class travelling?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I should say that that question was inherent in any reference to the Railways regarding the abolition of the first class coaches. The justification would be the economy that would result.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Would not the justification also be the isolation of some individuals from the rest?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** No, Sir. That is not a commercial consideration.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Is not the method of dealing with humanity one of the considerations of railway economy?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Yes, Sir, consistent with our other commitments.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** When was the attention of the Railway Administrations drawn first to this matter in order to elicit their opinions?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I cannot tell you the precise date.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Pending the formation of conclusions on this matter, will the Railway Board stop building first class coaches for next year?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I must have notice of that question.

... FALL IN RAILWAY EARNINGS.

475. **\*Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether the Railway earnings for State Railways are going down as compared with the income of the corresponding period last year? If so, from which time and why?

(b) Is it a fact that the income of the South Indian Railways has not gone down correspondingly? What is the difference due to?

(c) Is it a fact that the ratio of working expenses in State Railways to income is higher than in the South Indian Company-managed Railways?

(d) Are the rates and fares in the South Indian Railway lower than in the State-owned ones?

(e) What steps do Government propose to check the fall in the income of the State Railways?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) The approximate gross earnings of State-owned Railways during the current financial year have declined from the month of December, 1937, as compared with the actual



earnings of the previous year. This is due to a fall in the movements of certain commodities, principally cotton and oilseeds.

(b) Yes. The increase on the South Indian Railway is due principally to additional revenue accruing from coaching traffic.

(c) I would refer the Honourable Member to statement No. 5 on pages 43 and 44 of the Railway Board's Report on Indian Railways for 1936-37, Volume II, from which it will be seen that the ratio of working expenses to gross earnings on the South Indian Railway is not lower than it is on three, *viz.*, the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and North Western Railways, out of the four State-managed lines

(d) This is a matter of opinion but I have no reason to believe that the position on the South Indian Railway is on the whole substantially different from that on other railways.

(e) Government do not consider that present conditions call for any special action, as the recent decline in revenue receipts in relation to last year's receipts is due to traffic fluctuations.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** With reference to the answer to part (c), is it not a fact that the average pay of the officers of the South Indian Railway is much lower than that of any other Railway?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That may be so, but that has no effect on the earnings of the Railway.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND TRADE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NEPAL GOVERNMENT.

476. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will the Secretary for External Affairs please state, if there is a British Resident in Nepal?

(b) Is there a representative of the Nepal Government at the seat of the Government of India, or at the seat of the British Government?

(c) Does the representative of the Nepal Government in India enjoy the same privileges and rights as the representatives of European countries, like France, or Germany, or Italy, in India?

(d) Is there a British Trade Agent at the capital of Nepal?

(e) If the answer to part (d) be in the affirmative, what are his duties?

(f) Is there any Trade Agent for the Government of India in Nepal?

(g) Are there any restrictions to the entry into Nepal of Indians of all classes and if so, what are they?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** (a) No. There is a British Minister at the Court of Nepal.

(b) Yes. There is a Nepalese Consul General at Delhi and a Minister in London.

(c) Yes.

(e) Does not arise

(f) No.

(g) The Government of India are not aware of any such restrictions.

**Mr. Badri Dutt Pande:** Is it a fact that no Indian is allowed to enter Nepal except at the time of the Pasupati Mela without the permission of the Nepal Government?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I have no information of any such restrictions as I have already stated.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will the Government make inquiries on this subject?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I have already made inquiries, and, so far as I have discovered, there are no restrictions on the entry of Indians into Nepal, by which I mean that they do not require passports with Nepalese visa.

**Mr. Badri Dutt Pande:** Is it a fact that heavy duties are charged on Indian goods when they enter Nepal and there are no corresponding duties on Nepalese goods on this side of British India?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** That question, I submit, does not arise out of anything in the question on the paper.

**Mr. B. Das:** May I ask who pays the expenses of the British Minister at Nepal, India or Great Britain?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** That question also does not arise and I should require notice of it.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Apart from local restrictions in fact, are Indians free to go into Nepal as the Nepalese are free to come to India?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** So far as I know, the answer to that question is definitely in the affirmative.

#### STAFF IN THE BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT.

477. **\*Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Communications be pleased to state the name, qualifications, date of appointment, initial salary and any rise in salary, of all employees in connection with broadcasting in India, getting more than Rs. 100 a month?

(b) Have Government removed from office during the last four months any high salaried employees from this department?

(c) What were the reasons for their removal?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the table of the House.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise

Statement showing the names, qualifications, salary, etc. of the staff employed in headquarters and All India Radio.

Name.	Qualifications.	Date of appointment in the Department.	Initial appointment.	Initial pay.	Present appointment.	Present pay.	Remarks.
Rs.							
<i>Headquarters.</i>							
Lionel Fielden	..	30-8-1935	Controller of Broadcasting.	2,000	Controller of Broadcasting.	2,100	
A. S. Bokhari	B.A. (Cantab.), M.A. (Punjab), P.E.S.	10-3-1933	Station Director	880	Deputy Controller of Broadcasting.	1,000	
C. W. Goyder	B.Sc., A.C.G.I.	19-8-1936	Chief Engineer	1,650	Chief Engineer	1,700	
Nawab Ali	M.A.	1-9-1935	Superintendent	400	Superintendent	440	
S. N. Sen	B.Sc.	1-3-1935	Assistant	180	Assistant-in-Charge	210	
					Special pay	30	
					Assistant	150	
Ata Ullah Khan	B.A.	8-5-1936	Assistant	140	Assistant	150	
Bashir Ahmad Khan	Intermediate	1-11-1935	Clerk II Division	120	Assistant	140	
K. A. Narayanan	B.A.	23-5-1936	Assistant	100	Assistant	140	
B. N. Chaudhuri	B.A.	21-9-1936	Assistant	100	Assistant	245	
R. R. Bhatnagar	B.A.	10-7-1937	Assistant	245	Assistant	108	
Masudul Hassan	B.A.	14-6-1937	Clerk II Division	108	Clerk II Division	135	
K. R. Chandru	S.S.L.C.	23-4-1935	Stenographer	125	Stenographer	130	
G. Natarajan	Intermediate	1-10-1936	Stenographer	125	Stenographer	125	
F. Blessington	Senior Cambridge	22-11-1937	Stenographer	125	Stenographer	125	
<i>rogramme Establishment.</i>							
Mr. J. R. Stapleton	..	1-4-1930	Station Director	1,000	Station Director	1,000	Under suspension.
Mr. C. B. Sethna	..	1-4-1930	Station Director	600	Station Director	800	
Mr. Z. A. Bokhari	F.A., H.P. (Punjab) Training at British Broadcasting Corporation, B.A. (London)	26-11-1935	Director of Programmes.	308	Station Director	775	
Mr. A. A. Advani		11-8-1936	Assistant Station Director.	300	Station Director	500	

5. Mr. S. S. Niazi	B.A. (Hons.)	..	25-10-1935	Programme Assistant	100	Station Director. Special pay . Station Director	350 } 100 } 750 }
6. Mr. N. A. S. Laksh- manan	M.A. (Oxon.)	.	2-8-1936	Assistant Station Director.	300		
7. Mr. Rashid Ahmad	M.A.	.	13-10-1936	Director of Pro- grammes.	250	Officiating Station Director.	500
8. Mr. Victor Paranjoti	M.A. (Hons.) F. I.G. C. M. (England) ; Training at British Broadcasting Cor- poration.	.	8-10-1936	Director of Pro- grammes.	250	Officiating Station Director.	500
9. Mr. A. K. Sen	B.A. Training at British Broadcasting Corporation	.	25-10-1935	Programme Assistant	100	Assistant Station Director.	350
10. Mr. Jugal Kishore Mehra.	B.A.	.	1-4-1937	Sub-Editor, Awaz	150	Officiating Assist- ant Station Director.	350
11. Mr. K. S. Mallick	M.A.	.	21-1-1937	Sub-Editor Awaz	150	Officiating Assist- ant Station Director.	350
12. Mr. N. N. Mazumdar	Matriculate	.	1-4-1930	Director of Pro- grammes.	250	Director of Pro- grammes.	400
13. Mr. Uma Shankar	M.A.	.	3-2-1937	Programme Proba- tioner.	50	Director of Pro- grammes.	250
14. Mr. Somnath Chub	B.A. (Cantab.), M.A. (Pun- jab).	.	12-2-1938	Officiating Director of Programmes.	250	Officiating Director of Programmes.	250
15. Mr. B. S. Mardhekar	B.A.	.	1-2-1938	Officiating Director of Programmes.	250	Officiating Direc- tor of Programmes	250
16. Mr. P. V. Acharya	M.A. Training at British Broadcasting Corporation.	.	12-8-1936	Publicity Assistant	100	Officiating Direc- tor of Programmes	250
17. Mr. A. K. Nimkar	High School Standard	.	1-4-1930	Announcer and Translator.	100	Programme Assist- ant.	150
18. Mr. R. N. Sen	B.A.	.	1-4-1930	Translator	65	Programme Assist- ant.	120
19. Mr. B. K. Badra	B.A.	.	1-6-1930	Assistant Director of Programmes.	75	Programme Assist- ant.	150
20. Mr. P. R. Shoerey	B.Sc. (Manchester)	.	16-11-1934	Announcer	60	Programme Assist- ant.	150
21. Mr. A. S. Dholekar	..	.	15-12-1934	Sub Director of Programmes.	200	Programme Assist- ant.	210

Statement showing the names, qualifications, salary, etc., of the staff employed in All India Radio contd.

Name.	Qualifications.	Date of appointment in the Department.	Initial appointment.	Initial pay.	Present appointment.	Present pay.	Remarks.
				Rs.		Rs.	
<i>Programme Establishment—contd.</i>							
22. Mr. Iftekhar Ullah .	Matriculate .	25-10-1935	Programme Assistant	100	Programme Assistant.	150	
23. Mr. Mohd. Iqbal .	M.A. .	21-3-1936	Programme Assistant	100	Programme Assistant.	150	
24. Mr. A. Dinkar Rao .	Intermediate .	4-4-1936	Programme Assistant	100	Programme Assistant.	150	
25. Mr. D. S. Barq .	Intermediate .	2-12-1936	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150	
26. Mr. Malik Hasib Ahmad.	B.A. .	9-2-1937	Programme Assistant	100	Programme Assistant.	150	
27. Mr. M. B. Nagarkar .	B.A. .	1-4-1937	Programme Assistant	100	Programme Assistant.	150	
28. Mr. A. Qutb .	M.Sc. .	1-5-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150	
29. Mr. Ghulam Ali .	B.A. (Hons.) .	17-6-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150	
30. Mr. S. C. Chakravarty.	B.A., B.L. .	1-7-1937	Programme Assistant	150	Programme Assistant.	150	
31. Mr. B. K. Nundee .	B.Sc. .	1-7-1937	Programme Assistant	150	Programme Assistant.	150	
32. Mr. N. R. Bhattacharya.	Matric .	8-7-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150	
33. Mr. S. Arif .	..	1-10-1937	Programme Assistant	150	Programme Assistant.	150	
34. Mr. Hafeez Javed .	B.A. .	6-11-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150	

35. Mr. P. K. Mukherjee	B.Sc.	.	.	.	8-11-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Officiating Programme Assistant.	150
36. Mr. Ghulam Farid	B.Sc., LL.B.	.	.	.	9-11-1937	Programme Probationer.	50	Officiating Programme Assistant.	150
37. Mr. Hans Raj Luthra	M.Sc.	.	.	.	20-11-1937	Programme Assistant (Officiating).	150	Officiating Programme Assistant.	150
38. Mr. M. A. Rashid Akhtar.	B.A., LL.B.	.	.	.	21-1-1938	Programme Assistant (Officiating).	150	Officiating Programme Assistant.	150
39. Mr. R. Parthasarathi	B.A., B.L.	.	.	.	25-1-1938	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150
40. Mr. S. Ranganathan	B.A.	.	.	.	26-1-1938	Programme Probationer.	50	Programme Assistant.	150
41. Mr. N. S. Ramchandran.	M.A. (Hons.)	.	.	.	16-2-1938	Programme Assistant.	150	Programme Assistant.	150
42. Mr. B. Walke	Senior Cambridge (Hons.)	.	.	.	24-9-1937	Announcer	150	Announcer	150
43. Mrs. A. Pallot	Junior Cambridge	.	.	.	1-11-1937	Announcer	150	Announcer	150
<i>Editorial Establishment.</i>									
44. Mr. C. J. Barns	.	.	.	.	9-9-1937	News Editor + Overseas Pay.	1,000 } £30	News Editor + Overseas Pay.	1,000 } £30
45. Mr. A. N. Bhanot	B.A. (Hons.)	.	.	.	17-12-1937	Sub-Editor (News)	300	Sub-Editor (News)	300
46. Mr. F. M. de Mello	B.A., B.Sc.	.	.	.	3-1-1938	Editor "Indian Listener".	500	Editor "Indian Listener".	500
47. Mr. C. J. Curien	B.A.	.	.	.	2-3-1936	Sub-Editor "Indian Listener".	100	Sub-Editor "Indian Listener".	100
48. Mr. N. K. Sarkar	.	.	.	.	1-4-1932	Sub-Editor "Betar Jagat".	40	Sub-Editor "Betar Jagat".	160
49. Mr. Ghulam Abbas	.	.	.	.	9-8-1937	Translator	150	Sub-Editor "Awaz".	150
50. Mr. Mukand Kishore	M.A.	.	.	.	4-8-1937	Translator	150	Translator.	150
51. Mr. Sardar Ali Alvi	Intermediato	.	.	.	8-12-1937	Clerk	40	Translator	150

## Statement showing the names, qualifications, salary, etc., of the staff employed in All India Radio—contd.

Name.	Qualifications.	Date of appointment in the Department.	Initial appointment.	Initial pay.	Present appointment.	Present pay.	Remarks.
<i>Engineering Establishment.</i>							
Mr. S. Gopalan	Graduate I.E.E.	1-5-1936	Research Engineer	400	Research Engineer	420	
Mr. S. C. Roy	M.Sc., B.L.	1-4-1930	Station Engineer	350	Station Engineer	420	
Mr. T. K. Garudachar	M.A., Post Graduate Certificate in Electrical Technology of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore; Supplementary Certificate in Electrical Communication Engineering of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.	12-9-1932	Ditto	350	Ditto	400	
Mr. B. C. Sil	M.Sc. with special study and Research in Wireless.	10-4-1933	Ditto	200	Ditto	300	
Mr. B. J. Gulati	M.Sc., A.M.I.E.E. (Graduate-ship Examination).	27-11-1935	Technical Assistant	100	Officiating Station Engineer.	250	
Mr. A. C. Ramchandani	B.Sc. Eng. (London)	23-10-1933	Sub-Editor Indian Radio Times.	150	Ditto	250	
Mr. Chaman Lal	M.Sc.	1-4-1937	Station Engineer	200	Station Engineer	200	
Mr. B. V. Baliga	B.A., A.M.I.R.E. Certificate of Electrical Technology and Certificate of Communication Engineering of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.	4-11-1935	Assistant Engineer	180	Installation Engineer.	600	
Mr. T. D. Chatterji	B.Sc., Certificate of Electrical Technology and Certificate of Electrical Communication Engineering of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.	26-10-1935	Assistant Engineer	180	Deputy Installation Engineer.	300	

Mr. R. L. Suri .	B.A., A.M.I.E.T. (London); Member Acoustical Society of America.	20-11-1936	Technical Assistant	100	Ditto	300
Mr. W. D. Coysh	Certificate of Proficiency in Radio Telegraphy, Magneti- sism and Electricity. Machine and Drawing.	1-4-1930	Control Engineer	250	Assistant Engineer	300
Mr. D. S. Major .	Matriculate. Postmaster General's 1st Class Certi- ficate of Competency as Wireless Operator (1927 Convention).	1-9-1932	Assistant Engineer	150	Ditto	200
Mr. N. N. Dutt .	I.Sc., Certificate of Com- petency as Wireless Opera- tor.	1-4-1930	Ditto	50	Ditto	200
Mr. M. M. Khan .	M.Sc. Diploma in Commu- nication Engineering, Nor- thampton Polytechnic Institute, London.	18-12-1935	Technical Assistant	60	Ditto	200
Mr. P. B. Sen .	Matriculate. Qualified Wireless Telegraphist.	1-4-1931	Assistant Engineer	50	Ditto	200
Mr. M. D. Madhekar	Intermediate, P.M.C.'s First Class Certificate of Com- petency (1912 Conven- tion).	1-4-1930	Assistant Engineer	150	Officiating Assist- ant Engineer.	200
Mr. N. B. Mukherjee	M.Sc. . . . .	1-6-1935	Technical Assistant	60	Ditto	200
Mr. K. P. Banerjee	B.Sc. (Eng.) . . . .	1-11-1935	Ditto	60	Ditto	200
Mr. P. R. Khanna	B.Sc. (Eng.) . . . .	8-11-1935	Ditto	60	Ditto	200
Mr. B. R. Kapur .	A.M.I.E.E. London, Diplo- ma of Engineering from MacLagan College.	25-4-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	200
Mr. M. L. Sastri .	B.A., B.Sc. (Eng.) City and Guilds Final Examination in Electrical Engineering. City and Guilds Final Radio Engineering.	11-11-1935	Ditto	60	Ditto	200
Mr. M. D. Chaturvedi	B.Sc. (Eng.) . . . .	26-11-1935	Ditto	60	Ditto	200
Mr. A. K. Bose .	Matriculate; had three years Secondary Electrical Engineering Course.	15-8-1930	Assistant Engineer	60	Ditto	200



Statement showing the names, qualifications, salary, etc., of the staff employed in headquarters and All India Radio—contd.

Name.	Qualifications.	Date of appointment in the Department.	Initial appointment.	Initial pay.	Present appointment.	Present pay.	Remarks.
<i>Engineering Establishment—contd.</i>							
Mr. P. P. Mugaseth	Electrical Wireman's Certificate VJT and Government Certificate of Competency in Wiring, Class II.	1-4-1930	Technical Assistant	100	Technical Assistant	120	
Mr. J. D.' Lima.	High School Standard	1-4-1930	Ditto	100	Ditto	125	
Mr. B. B. Banerji	B.Sc.	1-4-1930	Assistant Engineer, Control	85	Ditto	110	
Mr. J. S. Rodricks	..	1-4-1930	Technical Assistant	100	Ditto	130	
Mr. K. L. Chopra	M.Sc.	23-4-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	110	
Mr. K. S. Rangaswami Iyengar.	B.Sc. (Eng.) London	10-5-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	110	
Mr. Jaya Chandre	M.Sc.	10-6-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	110	
Mr. Aijaz Mohd.	M.Sc.	11-7-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	110	
Mr. S. S. Kohli	M.Sc. Radio Communication City and Guilds Examination.	18-7-1936	Ditto	100	Ditto	110	
<i>Ministerial Establishment.</i>							
Mr. R. Pereira	Matriculate	22-5-1930	Accountant	250	Accountant	250	
Mr. S. Venkatesan	B.A., G.D.A.	1-8-1931	Accountant	100	Accountant	148	
Mr. Raz Ahmad	Matriculate	16-7-1936	Clerk	95	Accountant	130	
Mr. M. P. Sinha	Intermediate	14-9-1937	Divisional Accountant.	204	Divisional		
Mr. J. N. Raina	..	8-11-1937	Accountant	135	Accountant	204	
Mr. S. C. Bhowmick	Matriculate	1-4-1930	Clerk	45	Clerk.	135	
Mr. F. R. Muleo	Matriculate	1-9-1932	Clerk	50	Clerk.	104	
Mr. S. K. Rao	S.S.L.C.	1-4-1930	Stenographer	140	Stenographer	108	
Mr. K. N. S. Ram	S.S.L.C.	1-10-1937	Stenographer	125	Stenographer	130	
Miss. E. Mayhew	Senior Cambridge	1-10-1937	Stenographer	125	Stenographer	125	

CONSTRUCTION OF QUARTERS FOR THE STAFF OF THE RAILWAY CLEARING ACCOUNTS OFFICE, DELHI

478 \*Prof. N. G. Ranga: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state whether it is a fact that in February 1929, Government stated that land for constructing quarters for the staff of the Railway Clearing Accounts Office, Delhi, was owned by Government and that the work in its connection would commence by October or November of that year?

(b) Is it a fact that Sir George Rainy in September 1929 promised to give his personal attention to the question of early construction of these quarters and also stated that the question of constructing the quarters depended on getting a suitable site and not on money?

(c) Is it a fact that since the above statements were made, Government have postponed the construction of the above mentioned quarters for different alleged reasons, viz., declaration as medically unfit of the site owned by Government, non-availability of another suitable site at reasonable cost, want of funds for the work, etc., etc.

(d) Is it a fact that the District Medical Officer, North Western Railway, Delhi, had once reported that the clerks in Railway Clearing Accounts Office often consulted him for tuberculosis of lungs, or some such like diseases, and this among other reasons being due to overcrowding of office building, Government hoped to construct a new one in the near future, and that that has not yet been done?

(e) Is it a fact that the construction of quarters and an office building is linked up with the question of the permanency of location of the Railway Clearing Accounts Office in Delhi, and if so, when will Government arrive at a final decision in this case? If not, will the Honourable Member please make a statement in this connection?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) Mr. (now Sir Alan) Parsons, the then Financial Commissioner of Railways, stated in this House in February, 1929, that the site on which it was then intended to build quarters for the staff in question was already owned by Government and he expressed a hope that the quarters would be completed by October or November in that year, though he was not quite sure

(b) Yes

(c) and (e). With your permission, Sir, I shall explain briefly the causes that have led to the delay in the construction of these quarters. The site referred to in 1929 was eventually considered unsuitable by the medical authorities of the Railway Department, and thereafter the suitability of several other sites was examined. Before any decision could be reached, however, the financial situation deteriorated, and it was not possible for some years to proceed with the project. The question was again taken up in 1935 with a view to building quarters for the staff at Karol Bagh if practicable. Early in 1936, however, the Agents of certain railways suggested the desirability of closing the Railway Clearing Accounts Office and reverting to the arrangements that had previously obtained. After consideration of this suggestion, and also in connection with possible economies, certain changes have recently been introduced experimentally in the methods of work in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office. Some time must, however, elapse before the success or failure of these changes is

demonstrated, and in view of the opinion of the Agents alluded to above, it would be imprudent to embark on further capital expenditure on quarters in the interval. The Budget for 1938-39 does, however, contain provision for a small number of railway quarters which will be permanently necessary in Delhi, and on the completion of these the staff of the Railway Clearing Accounts Office will, along with certain others, be eligible to occupy them.

(d) It is true that on one occasion the District Medical Officer, North Western Railway, Delhi, reported to the Director, Railway Clearing Accounts Office, that clerks of his office seemed to suffer from tuberculosis of the lungs, and that in his view the over-crowded state of the office building was one of the causes of the disease. Subsequent investigation of this matter however raised very substantial doubts as to whether in the few cases that had actually come to notice the disease could be attributed to this cause.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** How long do they take to continue to examine this matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** If you have an office experiment in progress, I should say that at least a year would be necessary to determine whether it should be made permanent or not.

#### NON-STOPPAGE OF THE DOON EXPRESSES AT DHAMPUR

479. **\*Mr. Badri Dutt Pande:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if the people of Dhanpur have represented to the Railway authorities that Dhanpur is an important station on the East Indian Railway between Najibabad and Moradabad and that Nos 9 and 10 Up and Down Doon Expresses be stopped at Dhanpur for, say, three minutes or so?

(b) If so, what action have Government taken, or propose to take in the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) and (b) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that no representation is traceable either in his office or that of the Divisional Superintendent, Moradabad, within whose jurisdiction Dhanpur station is situated, and that connections and suitable arrival and departure from important points do not permit of No. 10-Down being booked to stop at Dhanpur station. No. 9-Up is already booked to stop there.

**Mr. Badri Dutt Pande:** Is it a fact that formerly this train used to stop at Dhanpur station?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I am unable to give the Honourable Member the information.

**Mr. Badri Dutt Pande:** Will the Honourable Member kindly forward this suggestion to the Railway Agent?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** The Agent has already been consulted in the matter, and he is perfectly well seized of the facts.

INDEBTEDNESS OF POWINDAHS OF AFGHANISTAN TO THE TRADERS OF DERA ISMAIL KHAN.

480 **Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Will the Foreign Secretary please state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Powindahs of Afghanistan owe something like 25 lakhs to the traders of Dera Ismail Khan in the North-West Frontier Province;
- (b) whether by far the greater portion of the above debt forms the subject matter of decrees under section 8 of the Frontier Crimes Regulation;
- (c) whether these indebted Powindahs have given up coming to India since 1933 and in consequence their creditors are unable to realise their debts;
- (d) whether the Afghan authorities have consistently refused to grant visas to these creditors, who intended to visit Afghanistan to realise their debts;
- (e) whether Government have taken any steps so far to help these traders; and
- (f) whether Government propose to make representations to Afghanistan in the interests of these traders; if not, why not?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** (a) Yes in March 1936, the Powindahs owed about Rs. 21 lakhs.

(b) Yes

(c) There is no evidence to show that the Powindahs have given up coming to India, and some of them are definitely known to have entered India.

(d) Yes

(e) Government have made frequent representations to the Afghan Government through His Majesty's Legation.

(f) No. Government have come to the conclusion that there is little or no prospect of recovering the debts through the Afghan Government, and that the best course is to take action against the debtors when they come down to India as most of them are believed to do.

**Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** With reference to part (c), is it a fact that the Deputy Commissioner, Dera Ismail Khan, has informed these traders admitting that the Powindahs have ceased to come to India?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I cannot answer that without notice.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** In view of the fact that the Afghan money-lenders lend large sums of money to the poor cultivators and others of this country and indulge in very bad practices leading to violence also in many cases, will Government try to prevent their entry into India as a retaliatory measure against the Powindahs?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** That appears to be an entirely separate question

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** What is the reason for the amount being non-recoverable? Is there no court of justice in Afghanistan?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** One of the main reasons, I think, is this, that the debtors belong to nomad tribes who are extremely difficult to get hold of in order to make them appear before a court of justice in Afghanistan.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Is it that they do not now want to come to India because of the Association or by whatever names it may be called, by which the Afghan Government have now taken in hand the export trade or dried fruits into India?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** There is no connection whatever, as far as I am aware between the Afghan Government's policy of trade monopolies and the Powindah migration.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** In what articles do the Powindah tribes trade?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** They bring down a variety of things, carpets and other things, but I cannot answer that question without making further enquiries.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** It was stated that the Afghan monopoly was confined to different articles, and I should like to know what are the articles covered by the Afghan monopoly trade and what are the articles generally dealt in by Powindahs?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I should be very glad to give him the information. I have already given the information as to the articles in which the Afghan monopoly deals. I could not tell all of them from memory. Both the questions I would be quite prepared to answer if the Honourable Member would give notice.

**Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** What is the reply of the Afghan authorities to the representation of this Government?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** So far our representations have been mainly unsuccessful. That is all I can say.

**Mr. Abdul Qaiyum:** Is it a fact that the Powindahs discontinuing their visits to India coincided with the setting up of monopoly in trade by the Afghan Government?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** I do not think there is any connection between the two, nor do I admit that the Powindahs have ceased to come.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

**Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** Is it not a fact that the Pathans who lend money have more faith in their sticks to recover their dues than in Courts of Justice?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

## CASES CONSIDERED BY THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

481. \*Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways state how many cases were considered by the Railway Rates Advisory Committee during each of the three years, 1935-36, 1936-37 and 1937-38 (up to the end of December), respectively?

(b) What was the cost incurred in connection with the working of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(c) Have Government under consideration any scheme to make any saving in this outlay?

The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart: (a) 1935-36—Four 1936-37—One, 1937-38—Three.

(b) 1935-36—Rs. 74,146 1936-37—Rs. 78,317 1937-38—Rs. 47,287 up to November, 1937

(c) No.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Do the Government consider the outlay on this committee properly spent?

The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart: The Honourable Member is asking for an expression of opinion.

## INADEQUATE RADIO PROGRAMMES OF INDIAN MUSIC, ETC., AFTER NINE O'CLOCK.

482. \*Mr. Manu Subedar: (a) Will the Honourable Member for Communications state whether Government are aware that Indian licensees of radio are not receiving Indian music on most days of the week after 9 o'clock at night?

(b) Are Government aware that very great discontent prevails amongst the licensees on account of the programmes, in which Indian music does not find an adequate and proper place?

(c) Are the majority of the licenseholders, from whom revenue is derived, Indians?

(d) Are Government prepared to take steps to make an enquiry whether this complaint of not giving adequate Indian programmes after 9 o'clock at night cannot be remedied?

The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart: (a) No, Sir. Indian music is generally included in programmes broadcast from all stations except Calcutta after 9 P.M.

(b) No.

(c) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me on the 3rd February, 1938, to part (b) of his starred question No. 121.

(d) I shall be glad to make an enquiry if the Honourable Member will inform me of his specific complaint.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is it a fact that Indian music stops at 9 P.M. and English music begins thereafter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I am afraid I cannot answer a question when it is couched in such general terms. It seems that the Honourable Member is ignoring the fact that there are several broadcasting stations. If he will give me his specific complaint relating to any particular station, I may be in a position to answer him.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta are the stations I am referring to.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have already admitted that as far as Calcutta is concerned there is no Indian music after 9 o'clock.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Why not?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Because I take it that those responsible for issuing the programmes are . . . .

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Englishmen?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart (continuing)** . . . . are aware of the nature of the programme demand in Calcutta.

**Seth Govind Das:** Are Government aware that in Bengal particularly the people are very much fond of Indian music and it is a very great hardship for them not to allow Indian music after 9 o'clock?

(No reply was given.)

**Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** Is it a fact that the majority of the listeners are Indians? If so, why should the music stop at 9 P.M.?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** That is a matter of argument.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Is it true that English music costs three times as much as Indian music of the all-India Radio?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of a question relating to individual costs.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Surely the Honourable Member knows all about it?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** If the Honourable Member knew he would have given an answer.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** May I know if Bengalees go to sleep at 9 P.M.?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I refer the Honourable Member to my Honourable colleague, the Leader of the House.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** It is true that in the Standing Finance Committee this ratio of the cost of Indian music and English music was given, namely, that English music is three or four times costlier?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** The Honourable Member is making a statement and not asking a question.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** I am asking whether the Honourable Member is aware of it.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** No, Sir.

#### PROGRAMMES AND RADIOS FOR RURAL AREAS.

488 **Mr. Manu Subedar:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Communications please state whether Government received a request at any time, that a programme should be given for agriculturists at about 7 o'clock in the evening?

(b) Are Government aware that it is at 7 o'clock that most of the listeners want to have an adequate advance programme of music?

(c) How many radios have been installed in rural areas that take advantage of this rural programme?

(d) Have Government enquired whether such programmes could not be arranged at some other time?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) and (d). No, but there is a demand for rural programmes. The time for broadcasting them, which varies according to the seasons of the year, is selected with reference to the maximum convenience of villagers for whom they are intended.

(b) No.

(c) No precise information is available. The total number installed by Provincial Governments is 91 at present, but the number is on the increase. The Madras and the United Provinces Governments have, for example, asked the All-India Radio to assist with the installation of 150 and 10 sets respectively, and the Government of India have sanctioned the installation of 120 sets in Delhi Province in the near future. There are, besides, sets installed by private individuals for rural listeners.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** With regard to part (a), from whom is such demand as is mentioned in the answer received?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** From the Provincial Governments among others.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Do the Government of India pay any subsidy for the installation of these rural community sets?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** We ourselves are providing 120 sets for the Delhi station.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** How many rural sets are controlled or are within the area of the Delhi station, out of the 91?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** At a guess, I should say about 20 to 30 at the present time.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Are Government aware that about 20,000 lovers of Indian music tune in at 7 o'clock in the Delhi station?



**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of that question. I am not responsible for that Department.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state whether the Government have heard of any complaints that the honoraria payable to Indian music artists are not received by them in full,

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of that question. I am not responsible for that Department.

**OF MR. BORAHAI, DIRECTOR OF THE BROADCASTING STATION BOMBAY**

**184 Mr. Manu Subedar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state the educational and other qualifications of Mr. Borahai, who is now in the Department of Broadcasting, Bombay?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of that question.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** What was his salary when he joined the Department first when he was working in Delhi and now when he is sent to Bombay respectively?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) Mr. Z. A. Borahai is 33 years of age. He is an undergraduate of the Punjab University and has passed the Honours Examination in Persian. He was a Civilian Translator in the General Staff Branch of Army Headquarters, and since joining All-India Radio has received training with the British Broadcasting Corporation.

(b) The decision was made on administrative grounds.

(c) He is a Deputy Director of Programmes of the Department of Broadcasting, Bombay. His salary is Rs. 1,500 per mensem. When transferred to Bombay, he was drawing Rs. 775 per mensem as Station Director, Delhi. His pay remains the same in Bombay.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** What was his salary when he was Civilian Translator?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I shall require notice of that question. I am not responsible for that Department.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Was it Rs. 45?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have not the slightest idea.

#### COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT

**485 \*Mr. Manu Subedar:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications state

(a) whether Government have heard of any complaints that the honoraria payable to Indian music artists are not received by them in full,

(b) whether Government have heard of any other complaints in connection with the arrangement of programmes, the selection of administrative staff, the selection of artists or any other type of misdirection in connection with broadcasting;

(c) will the Government be considering the appointment of a Committee in order to look into the whole matter and advise on these matters, and

(d) if not, to what (c) is in the negative, whether Government will give reasons for their decision?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) No

(b) criticisms both adverse and appreciative of the programmes of the Government which have from time to time appeared in the press have not to my knowledge been taken into account. It has also been raised in questions in the House.

(c) and (d) None of the complaints that I have heard justifies an appointment of a Committee to investigate them.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Are Government regularly receiving papers, reports and others which are making comments on the working of this section of the Department?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Manu Subedar:** Have they investigated into the nature of complaints which are also indicated in this question?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Yes, Sir.

#### LOSS OF INDIAN LIFE AND PROPERTY IN SHANGHAI DUE TO SINO-JAPANESE WAR

186. **Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will the Foreign Secretary state

(a) what has been the extent of the loss of Indian life and property in Shanghai because of the Sino-Japanese war

(b) whether there was loss of Indian life and property in other theatres of war, if so, where and to what extent, and

(c) whether any compensation was claimed for these losses and with what result?

**Sir Aubrey Metcalfe:** (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave on the 31st January, 1938, to Mr. Badri Dutt Pande's stated question No. 20 in so far as loss of Indian life is concerned. The only reported loss of Indian property is the destruction of a silk shop at Nanking.

(b) No damage to life and property of Indian subjects has been reported in other theatres of war in China.

(c) No claims for compensation have yet been made, but His Majesty's Government propose to make claims from the appropriate Government.

RESTRICTION FOR THIRD CLASS PASSENGERS TO TRAVEL BY MAILS ON THE  
EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

488. **Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state if it is a fact that till recently third class passengers holding tickets for distances exceeding 100 miles, were allowed to travel by Nos. 1 and 2. East Indian Railway mail trains? If so, has there been any change in this rule?

(b) Are Government aware of the difficulties experienced by the travelling public? If so, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of restoring the old rule?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the Agent, East Indian Railway, states that, with effect from the 15th December, 1937, only those third class passengers, (excluding servants of first and second class passengers), are allowed to travel by 1-Up and 2-Down Mails who hold tickets *between* Howrah and *via*, and stations above Moghal Sarai and *via*.

(b) I understand that the change in the rule was due to the curtailment of third class accommodation, in order to provide more accommodation for upper class passengers, as first and second class carriages were running regularly crowded. As a set off against this restriction, 13-Up and 14-Down Express trains were accelerated and run close to the mail trains' timings. In these circumstances, it seems unlikely that the East Indian Railway Administration could consider re-introducing the rule previously in force.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** With reference to part (b) of the question, may I know what constitutes over-crowding in the first and second class, on account of which facilities of third class passengers have been curtailed?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** My interpretation of the phrase is that there were more passengers wishing to travel than there were seats to accommodate them.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** By "seats" does the Honourable Member mean berths; or the number of persons allotted for each compartment?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I mean the number of passengers allotted for each compartment.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Does the Honourable Member seriously mean that every second class compartment contained more than twelve passengers and every first class had more than six?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That, Sir, is what I assume was the experience of the Administration who made the alteration.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Will the Honourable Member make sure of the facts on this basis because usually when a first class passenger finds anyone besides himself in his compartment, he thinks it is overcrowded?

(No reply was given.)

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Now I know whether any complaints were made in this connection?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** No, Sir, I cannot give that information.

#### NEW RULES FOR ISSUE OF PASSES TO RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

489. **Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state whether Government have come to any decision on representations submitted by the Railway employees protesting against the new pass rules?

(b) Was the question discussed at the last Conference between the representatives of the Railway Federation and the Railway Board or at any other time?

(c) What are the final conclusions of Government in the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** (a) to (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's question No. 326 on the 16th February, 1938.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** In view of the decision of this House on the cut motion last night, will Government please reconsider their position and improve the pass privileges of these railway employees?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I see no relation between the successful cut motion of yesterday evening and the pass rules.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Is it a fact that the predecessor of the Honourable Member made some recommendations in this connection?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** If my predecessor had made any recommendations they were of a confidential nature, and I should certainly not in any case admit that they had been made.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Is the Honourable Member aware that his predecessor stated before the House in Simla Session that very shortly decisions would be taken in the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** If the Honourable Member will refer to the question which I quoted and to the supplementaries arising thereout, he will get all the information he requires.

---

#### UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

##### GRIEVANCES OF THE EX-BRAKESMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

36. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state whether it is a fact that on the amalgamation of the East Indian Railway with the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway in 1925 the posts of brakemen were abolished?

(b) Is it a fact that some of the old brakemen were utilised as free service clerks and later on designated as letter delivery clerks on the same pay and allowances which they enjoyed as brakemen?

(c) Is it a fact that letter delivery clerks employed before the 1st January, 1925, were in the scale of Rs. 26—2—40 *plus* Rs. 5 fixed allowance paid under Resolution No. 1260 of 1908?

(d) When were the posts of brakesmen abolished in 1925, and why were those men not given the pay of letter delivery clerks in which category they were utilised, *viz.* Rs. 26—2—40 *plus* Rs. 5?

(e) Is it a fact that the pay of letter delivery clerks was again revised and the following scale sanctioned Rs. 24—2—36 *plus* daily allowance?

(f) Why were the ex-brakesmen again not fitted into this scale (Rs. 24—2—36)?

(g) Is it a fact that the scales of this class were again revised to Rs. 18—1—27 and it was now only that the ex-brakesmen were fitted into these new scales?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41 together.

I am obtaining information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

#### GRIEVANCES OF THE EX-BRAKESMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

37. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state why, when the posts of brakesmen were abolished on the amalgamation of East Indian and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways in 1925 they were not fitted into some other branch earlier than 1935?

(b) From which date to which date were the following designations in force on the East Indian Railway, what were their duties, and what were the scales of pay and allowances of each category?

Brakesmen.

Free Service Clerks,

Letter Delivery Clerks,

Train Despatch Clerks, and

Sorters.

(c) What was the administrative necessity of changing the designations so often?

(d) What is the difference in the duties of a sorter and a letter delivery clerk?

#### PAY OF SORTERS ON STATE RAILWAYS AND IN POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

38. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether Government consider the proportionate pay in other departments of Government employment before fixing the rates of pay on State Railways?

(b) What is the pay of sorters on State Railways and in the Postal Department, including the Railway Mail Service?

---

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 36.

### EXCLUSION OF EX-BRAKESMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF PROVIDENT FUND.

33. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state how many ex-brakesmen (now called sorters) there are in the Moradabad Division of the East Indian Railway and what is the length of their service and for how long a period they were members of Provident Fund and since when they have been excluded from this membership to Provident Fund?

(b) Have they been refunded the Provident Fund Account? If not, why not?

(c) Under which rule have they been excluded from the membership to Provident Fund after having been members of this Fund for many years past?

### CLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYEES PERFORMING CLERICAL WORK AS MENIAL SERVANTS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

†40. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether there is any rule under which employees performing clerical work can be classed as menial servants on the State Railways?

(b) Is it a fact that staff employed for receiving and delivering Railway letters, ticket bundles, ticket bags, etc., and preparing guidance thereof, like guards, were held to be clerical staff and are now classed as menial staff and excluded from membership to Provident Fund?

### RESTORATION OF OLD SCALES OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES TO EX-BRAKESMEN ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†41. **Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please state whether it is a fact that the Agent, East Indian Railway, sanctioned the replacement of three brakesmen in the grade Rs. 16—2—28 each by three letter delivery clerks in the grade Rs. 26—2—40 in 1934?

(b) Is it a fact that the remaining brakesmen were ordered by the Agent to continue on their old pay and allowance till they vacated the post?

(c) Is it a fact that the Agent further ordered that when vacancies occurred, letter delivery clerks in the new grade of Rs. 24—2—36 should be engaged?

(d) Why were the brakesmen fitted in the new scale in 1935 (Rs. 18—1—27) if they continued performing the same old functions of letter delivery clerks under the designation of sorters?

(e) Is the Honourable Member prepared to look into the matter and order the restoration of the old rates of pay and allowances to ex-brakesmen, now called sorters, or order them to be placed in any of the following old scales:

Rs. 26—2—40 plus Rs. 5, or

Rs. 24—2—36 plus daily allowance?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM "BONA FIDE" IN RULE 16 (3) OF STATE RAILWAY PROVIDENT FUND RULES.

**42. Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** Will the Honourable the Railway Member be pleased to state the significance of the term "*bona fide*" used in Rule 16 (3) of State Railway Provident Fund Rules?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** The term carries its commonly accepted significance.

---

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MOLESTATION OF AN INDIAN GIRL AND FIRING ON RESCUERS BY EUROPEAN SOLDIERS IN MUTTRA DISTRICT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of a motion for the adjournment of the House from Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur to this effect:

To discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance relating to the molestation of a Hindu girl by three European soldiers and opening fire on the rescuers of the village of Badli and Athara which has resulted in the death of a poor villager named Bhai Suran.

When did this take place?

**Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur** (South Madras, Muhammadan): It appeared in today's paper. There is a telegram from Muttra to the effect that a Hindu girl was molested by three European soldiers and when they began to take her away forcibly, they were pursued.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I simply wanted to know how the Honourable Member came to know of it. Is there any objection?

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie** (Defence Secretary): I have no more knowledge of the incident than what has appeared in the press this morning.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I do not want a discussion now. What I wanted to know was whether it was of recent occurrence, and if there is any objection to this motion.

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie:** My own objection is that according to the account it is likely to be *sub judice* by now.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion will be taken up tomorrow at 4 o'clock, as today in the afternoon the demands for grants have to be disposed of, unless they are disposed of by 4 o'clock of which I do not see there is any chance.

---

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*concid.*

DEMAND No. 1—RAILWAY BOARD.

*Failure to completely Indianise the Railway Services and the Railway Board.*

**Mr. Abdul Qaiyum** (North-West Frontier Province: General): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, it has become a regular feature on the part of the Members on this side of the House to urge upon the unsympathetic authorities the question of Indianisation of the services, and in spite of the fact that whenever such motions are brought, they are carried and Government sustain defeats, yet we find that, year after year, there is very little improvement, i.e., satisfactory or substantial improvement in the matter of Indianisation. It seems that, because of the frequency of such motions, the authorities concerned imagine that the matter is not so serious. I submit, Sir, that this is a matter of first rate importance, and it is high time that the authorities gave their earnest attention to this matter and completely Indianised the services. We are told all sorts of things by the other side of the House, but I submit there is absolutely no moral justification for the retention of any foreign element in the railway services: the only justification that can be found, if one were to think out a justification, is that the British have conquered India, and that they have a right to have a lion's share of the services as a result of their conquest. Besides this, there is absolutely no moral justification, and the time has arrived when those in charge of the Railway Department seriously realised that they should completely Indianise the railway services by stopping once for all the recruitment of Europeans into any branch of the service. There is no other method by which these services can be completely Indianised.

Now, what is the position, Sir? If the House will bear with me I will quote some figures which I have taken from the Government report. We find on page 84 that gazetted officers on State-managed railways and officers of the corresponding rank on Company-managed, class I, railways (excluding H. E. H. the Nizam's and Jodhpur Railways) were as follows: On 1st April, 1925, there were: Europeans, 1,485; and Indians, 463. On 31st March, 1937, we find, in spite of the talk of sympathy with the question of Indianisation, that there were: Europeans, 1,026; and Indians, 826. In 1925, Europeans formed 71.98 per cent. on State-managed railways, and 82.26 on Company-managed railways: in 1937, we find that, in the gazetted services of the Railway Department, Europeans are 52.56 in the State-managed railways, and 59.33 in the Company-managed railways.

Now, there has been some progress in Indianisation, but I contend that the progress is very slow, and that the rate at which Indianisation is taking place is far from satisfactory. Indianisation, to be effective, must begin at the top, and unless and until you completely stop further recruitment of Europeans to the superior railway services, and unless and until you decide that you will have no other persons as gazetted officers except Indians or people domiciled in India, this problem will not be solved. Now, coming to the subordinate services, here also you find that the European element is considerable. Now, I am talking of subordinate services on scales of pay of Rs. 250 per mensem and more on class I railways, excluding H. E. H. Nizam's and Jodhpur Railways. On the 1st April, 1925, there were 2,412 Europeans and 5,410 Indians: the percentage of the Europeans was 30.84. In 1937, we find that even in the subordinate services drawing a salary of Rs. 250 and above, the number of Europeans was 1,261 while the number of Indians was 6,830, or a percentage of roughly 15.59. In the matter of direct recruitment and promotions we find that the Indians have not had a square deal in



[Mr. Abdul Qayum.]

spite of this talk of Indianisation. The condition as far as the recruitment and promotion is concerned, from the Indian point of view, is absolutely unsatisfactory. On the State-managed railways there were 18 appointments to the superior services in 1936-37; and in spite of the fact that the European element is very considerable there, the railway authorities recruited three Europeans by direct recruitment. As far as the lower gazetted service in the State Railways is concerned, there were 32 promotions and of these 15 went to Europeans in 1936-37; and out of the remaining 17 five were promotions which fell to the share of the Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans; this means that out of 32 promotions more than half fell to the share of the Europeans in that service.

If we take the case of the Company-managed railways in the matter of direct recruitment to the superior establishment, class I, seven Europeans were recruited as against 16 Indians—giving a percentage of 30·4, which is a very high percentage. Taking the vacancies filled up by promotion in those railways in 1936-37, eight Europeans were promoted as against 10 Indians; and it is a very significant fact that the 10 Indians include Domiciled Europeans and Anglo-Indians. On page 83 of the Report we find that the language, where the Company-managed railways are discussed, is very apologetic and an attempt is made on the part of the Railway Board to whitewash this act of the Company-managed railways in which they have deliberately set at naught the policy of rapid Indianisation of the superior railway services.

I was discussing the case of officers on State-managed railways and officers of corresponding rank in the Company-managed railways, and I said that on the 1st April, 1925, there were 1,485 Europeans as against 463 Indians. On the 31st March, 1937, the situation had not changed much from the Indian point of view; there were still 1,026 Europeans as against 826 Indians. In 1925, the percentage of Europeans in the higher gazetted services was 76·23 and at present, in 1937, it is 55·40. There is another significant fact which appears from this report and it is this; that while on the 31st March, 1936, the percentage of Europeans in the higher services was 15·15, on the 31st March, 1937, this percentage had risen to 15·59.

This is the position as far as the railway services are concerned and it is obvious that the really important posts, the posts which mean power, the posts which really enable people to make decisions on questions of policy, which direct the policy of all these railways in India, are still held by Europeans and they sit there safely entrenched. In spite of all this talk of Indianisation the progress has been very very slow indeed.

I now turn to the Railway Board. I find from this very report—perhaps the position has become worse since then—that the Indian Member in charge of Communications has disappeared making room for the Honourable Member now in charge of that Department. This is also a step in the direction of Indianisation! In the Railway Board itself we find that out of 19, 8 were Europeans—*vide* Appendix H, Vol. I of the Report of the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1936-37; of the attached officers, four out of five are Europeans. In the Central Standards Office, we find there is only one Indian out of

eight officers. In the Central Publicity Bureau both are Europeans, in the Overseas Bureau, one is Indian out of two. The only part of this department where we have some Indianisation is the office of the Controller of Railway Accounts where all the three incumbents are Indians.

Now Sir, this position which I have analysed is far from satisfactory. The tendency, with the approach of Federation, is to use the Centre as a sort of haven of refuge for all European officers, and all these new posts which have been created on one pretext or another are being handed over to the Europeans: all the important posts are going to the Europeans. I believe that if the railway authorities would say honestly and frankly that for a certain superior post they cannot possibly find any Indian with the requisite qualifications, if they can make that statement with their hands on their hearts, then there will be no objection to their going abroad in search of some experts; but here we find that in this country where there is such a large number of unemployed educated persons who are in search of employment, we find that in spite of the fact that Indians with the requisite qualifications are present and are quite capable of filling these posts, there is a mad search for recruits from abroad who are being dumped into this country, snatching away all the jobs which should rightly go to Indians. And they are entrenched in positions of power there, from which it is very difficult to dislodge them :

There is absolutely no necessity to advance any reasons in favour of Indianisation. I contend that Indianisation is the right and the necessary thing and that no reasons are required in support of this plea for Indianisation. It is our right to enjoy and occupy all these services in the railways in this country and the time has arrived when the Railway Authority should make a declaration that henceforth they will not recruit a single person from abroad and that they will make it a point to employ Indians and Indians only. Unless and until this is done, all this talk of Indianisation is absolutely of no use. It is not sincere, it is not going to bring about any real and effective change in the position of the various races in the service. The Government of India must come out with a clear and definite declaration in favour of Indianisation and make a solemn promise that in future they will not recruit even a single person from abroad—because if this is done it will be a glaring injustice to the people of this country.

It is not merely a question of arguments being advanced in favour of Indianisation, but it is a matter of sentiment as well, and I think sentiment counts for much more than figures. Sir, it is really a matter of shame and humiliation that in India all these positions of power, all these important gazetted posts, the key positions as it were, should be occupied by people who come from a different country. It really hurts our national pride, it hurts our self-respect, and we feel mortified to see that while unimportant jobs which really do not matter are given to Indians, the positions which really matter are kept in the hands of Britishers, and Indians, in spite of their education, in spite of their efficiency, in spite of the fact that they can more than hold their ground against the best people from England, are relegated to subordinate position and treated as hewers of wood and drawers of water in their own country. This is really a very deplorable state of affairs. There

[Mr. Abdul Qayyum.]

is absolutely no justification for the attitude which the Government have taken up in persistently refusing to carry into effect their oft repeated promises in regard to Indianisation.

Sir, it is customary in these cuts for the Mover to move his cut and then for certain other Members to stand up either to speak in favour of the motion or against it. The Treasury Benches generally observe silence till the very last moment, and then they come up with their facts and figures, and avoid answering certain points raised, while they introduce some new points knowing full well that there is absolutely no opportunity for the other side to reply to those points. I suggest, Sir, it would be a very proper thing if some Member other than the Member in charge of Communications gets up and puts forward the case for the Government so that opportunity may be afforded to a Member on the Opposition Benches to refute the points made by the Government.

Sir, I have tried in this very short speech to show that in the matter of direct recruitment as also in the matter of promotions, a grave injustice is done to Indians, and when we come to Company-managed railways, we find they are the worst offenders . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

**Mr. Abdul Qayyum:** Very well, Sir, I shall finish within two minutes.

There is one very strong reason why these Company-managed railways should be brought under State control, and it is this. In the Company-managed railways, we find there is less readiness to adopt the principle of Indianisation, and in spite of the promises of the Government to Indianise the services, the Company-managed railways still recruit Europeans by direct recruitment and by promotion to the extent of 50 per cent. I have quoted figures in support of it. There is absolutely no reason why the Government should not make a declaration that henceforth they will not recruit a single person from abroad, and that they will completely Indianise all the services.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Maulana Zafar Ali Khan** (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I shall take only a few minutes. I entirely agree with all the observations made by my friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum but I must point out that there is no getting away from the fact that the Railway Department is a reserved department, and as long as it is a reserved department, it will continue to be a happy hunting ground for Europeans; and if they frankly admit that they have conquered India by the sword and they shall keep it by the sword, it will be very nice indeed, but they will not do it. They want to pose as the guardians of India. They say that India is unfit to manage her own affairs, and that if they were not in India, there would have been bloodshed and revolution and what not. So, when we talk of Indianisation, what do we mean? We make speeches, very fine speeches indeed, but as long as these speeches have not an effective sanction behind them, I mean the sanction of the sword, the

sanction of the right arm, the speeches are of very little use. There is no getting away from the fact that there are 60,000 British soldiers and bayonets in India, and as long as they are in this country, we have no right to talk of depriving the Britishers of the lion's share of the loaf. They have a "right" to have a larger share in the superior services than their population basis would justify. We talk of Federation, we talk of a free India. When a free India comes into existence, then and then alone we will have the right to Indianise all the services in the administration, but as long as we are slaves, our position may be likened to that of the bird in the cage which has been described by the poet in these two lines:

*"masal yeh meri ko hosh Pi ha koi baaghe asi*

*kar pehne in a farahan khas ushyan ko Tum "*

Rendered into English, it means this:

"I may be likened to the bird in the cage which flutters and collects a few twigs to build its nest in the cage."

So, Sir, our speeches have their limitations, and they may be likened to the efforts of the bird in the cage. Free India first, and then we can talk of Indianisation and other things. There are provinces which now enjoy Provincial Autonomy. Use what little power that has been given to you in the provinces to the best of your ability, fight the Viceroy, just as Pandit Pant has fought, just as the Bihar Minister has fought, and then only the Britisher will bow down to you, knowing full well that what little they have given you in the provinces is welcome to you, but directly you get into the higher sphere then they say, "Well, go down". So, this is the Railway Department; it is a reserved department, as I have said already, and, therefore, do not talk of your rights in that department. Then, there is also the Military Department; do not talk of your rights in that department. There is moreover the Department dealing with external affairs, and you have no right to talk of Indianising the services in that department either. These are things reserved for the Britishers, and as long as they hold the sword in their right hand, we dare not ask for anything. You can make speeches, very fine speeches, you can put forward your logic; our friend, Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, will be cheered as soon as he comes in or when he makes a fine speech, but what can our speeches do to compel the railway authorities or the Foreign Department to listen to you? That is all I have to say in support of this cut; but for God's sake you must make up your differences, the differences between Hindus and Mussalmans. The bone of contention is there.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better address himself to the subject before the House.

**Maulana Zafar Ali Khan:** I say that Mr. Jinnah is the man who can deliver the goods. You must have a heart to heart talk with him.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must confine himself to the motion before the House.

**Maulana Zafar Ali Khan:** All right, Sir. That is all I have got to say.

**Pandit Shambhu Dayal Misra** (Central Provinces Hindi Division, Non-Muhammadian). Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood as opposing this motion. In my opinion the motion and several such of its kind are based more or less on a misapprehension of the basic principles underlying the railway policy of the British in India as a whole. The result is that not only do we waste our time in echoing our grievances but also give opportunities to the communalists to spoil the atmosphere of the Assembly.

The position in my opinion is this and I would like to give to the House a historical perspective of the policy of what our friends on this side of the House call Indianisation and what the Treasury Benches call Europeanisation of the railway services. Sir, it is not necessary to remind the Assembly that out of a total sum of Rs. 1,200 crores, Rs. 750 crores is the debt due from railways. In other words, though practically the whole of the debt due for other services has been wiped off or secured, the one due from railways has been retained and that with a purpose. It is necessary to tell the House a short history as introductory to the subject in hand. In the year 1922, at the Gaya session of the Congress, the Congress repudiated the public debt of India unless it was scrutinised by an independent tribunal. Next year in 1923, the Congress entered the Legislature. It, therefore, became necessary for the Government to take away the railways from the control of the Assembly. The major portion of the British capital was sunk there and it formed the bulk of the public debt of India incurred for the Imperialistic domination of India. In the year 1924, in the March Session of the Assembly a Resolution was moved for the separation of railway finance from general finance under the pretext that it was a more convenient form of administration and to save the General Budget from what they called the violent fluctuations of the railway finance. The Assembly as constituted was not agreeable to the proposal and the proposal was adjourned to the Simla Session. In the Simla Session, there was very great opposition to the proposition of separation and ultimately there was a compromise by which an agreed formula was drawn up, which contained besides provision for depreciation fund and interest on capital, also a condition of Indianisation.

From that day till 1929, that is, up to the time the Swarajists were in the Assembly, the Government complied with the agreement arrived at and even agreed to the appointment of an Indian to the Railway Board in the person of Mr. Hayman. But as soon as the Swarajists left the Assembly and took to direct action outside, the Government began to consolidate its power and tighten its hold on the people by not only not contributing towards the depreciation fund and interest but also by Europeanisation of the services. From 1930-34, this state of things went on till links were forged to tighten the hold of British Imperialism on India by taking away the control of the railways from the people of India and the provision was made in the Government of India Act, section 187, to that effect. In spite of the Assembly then being a tame one, it could not agree to the legislation for the establishment of a Federal Railway Authority on the lines proposed and after the enactment of the Government of India Act the Government resorted to other means of effectuating their sinister purpose.

On the 16th January, 1936, Sir Otto Neimeyer arrived in India and the Government was able to persuade him to append a note. This was in April, 1936. On the 5th September, during the course of the proceedings

of the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Satyamurti, as he himself says, was caught napping by the Honourable the Finance Member and he agreed to the appointment of an expert to survey the financial position of the railways and to find out ways and means for funding the provinces in the manner indicated in the Niemeyer Award. Instead of one expert, three experts were called and they were more or less Imperial arbitrators to settle the dispute between the Government of India and the British financiers to find out the best manner of securing the debt of the British financiers due from the Government of India and which was being repudiated by the Congress and, as I said, most of it is confined to the railways. That was the reason why no Indian was taken in the Committee; because by the very nature of things, it was a confidential affair. They produced a report in which four principles were laid down: (1) that there was no mismanagement; (2) that the management should go to the companies, that is, the British financiers and thus be taken away from political interference; (3) that the railways should be relieved of the obligation of the arrears of debt due to the depreciation fund and interest on capital; and (4) there should be Europeanisation of the services and the key positions in the services should be in the hands of the Europeans. In other words, this document is a counter repudiation of the separation convention, a counterblast to the Congress repudiation of the public debt. In the Simla Session of the Assembly we had a debate on the Wedgwood Committee Report and I was surprised again that it was abruptly by an agreement adjourned *sine die* under a promise, entered subsequently on 7th October, 1937, by the Resolution on moratorium, to give some contribution to the provinces.

You will thus see, Sir, that we have practically mortgaged our future to the British financiers and the Army being already under the control of the Crown Representative we have unwittingly and to our shame made over the control of the means of communication of the Army to the hands of the Britishers, under a shady promise of help to the provinces out of the income-tax receipts, with the newly created post of a British Member of Communications as the managing director of the corporation of British financiers.

Under the circumstances, unless we muster strongly under one banner and fight this British Imperialistic domination I see no use whatsoever of talking of Indianisation and such other useless matters.

It may not be of interest to the Assembly to know that I have returned back to it after a lapse of full 12 years, but I find that it has become a fashion now to talk all and sundry to maintain one's contact with the constituency, and naturally in this state of politics, unless one wants a final exit from the Legislature he has to speak.

I, therefore, sincerely apologise to you, Sir, for the little oddity that may have crept in during the course of my speech as I am not addicted to talking loudly. It was necessary for me to speak on this subject inasmuch as I was a party to the separation convention at Simla in 1924, and it would be of interest to mention that we had very nearly staked the presidentship of one of your predecessors on the insistence of this condition as to Indianisation. We are sorry that we have unwittingly lost our case by agreeing to matters in advance which have throttled our future. I do not know in what manner it will be possible to ensure Indianisation when

[Pandit Shanbhu Dayal Misra]

the only matter left out is the settlement of liability of the railways to the Government of India and the placing of the control of railways in the hands of British Imperialists.

**Mr. M. S. Azey** (Berar Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I support the motion moved by my friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum. We have listened to speeches from Honourable Members who have approached this question from different points of view and who yet came to the same conclusion. My friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, as well as my friend, Pandit Shanbhu Dayal Misra, are agreed on one point, *viz.*, that it is useless for us to move any cut for the sake of Indianization, although the grounds on which both of them justify their conclusion are like the two poles asunder. Sir, the question of the Indianization of the railways or for that matter of any of those services which control the destinies of the people of this country cannot be satisfactorily solved unless we are masters in our own house, and in view of the tardiness with which this question is approached and tried to be solved, there is bound to be some feeling of despair and despondency on this side of the House.

Sir, Government has never conceded one point whenever they had any occasion to consider this question. Whenever the question of Indianization of the services was approached by the Government either in connection with the appointment of a Commission or holding any other kind of enquiry, they never wanted to make a secret of one point, *viz.*, that they always regarded that there is some necessity, or some indispensability, of maintaining a certain European element in every service. On that point they are very strong. They have always contended that a certain minimum strength of Europeans must be maintained and without that they do not regard that the services can ever come up to what they consider to be the proper degree of efficiency. Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum, has tabled today a motion which is a sort of protest against that standpoint. And I want the Government to note that there is some difference between the way in which this demand has been urged on the floor of this House several times before and the manner and the spirit in which it is being tabled today. My friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum, distinctly wants the Government to commit itself to this principle that the services have to be completely Indianized, and no fraction of the services is to be retained for the sake of providing for any number of Europeans at all. That is the point of view which my friend has placed before this House, but I am sure that a demand like that will be resisted tooth and nail by the Members opposite. Sir, there is no question of a compromise between this side and that side. Those who stand for complete Indianization also stand for complete independence of this country, and those who stand for a gradual process of Indianization, leaving always a fraction for exploitation by the foreigners and Europeans, stand for a qualified kind of independence or a qualified kind of emancipation. The two points of view are absolutely different. But the point of view which my friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum, wants to press is this that the time has now come for the Government to recognize clearly that no important service can hereafter be allowed to be under the control and management of Europeans in any form. Sir, what are the grounds, what can be the justification for the Government to adopt any other view? Take the Reports of the Public

Service Commission the Lee Commission and other kinds of reports that dealt with this subject and we shall always find that there is some reservation and that reservation is to this effect that some minimum proportion of the services must be preserved in the interests of Europeans. But the standpoint of the people of this country is this that we have outgrown that stage of tutelage we have outgrown that stage of being cared for by somebody else and the Government must know that they have to deal with a set of people entirely different from those with whom they have been dealing previously,—whatever justification for that stage of tutelage for us there might have been previously, which, of course, I do not admit. Sir, for a long time the educated classes have been content with the position that this Government has to grant to us gradually certain rights and it is their duty to train people in the art of administration and for them to remain here as teachers for some time to come. That stage, however, I say, has now gone. The Indian National Congress, as also all the other public bodies have declared their goal to be that of complete independence, complete emancipation of this country from foreign domination. When that goal is declared, then the Government either has to accept that as the correct goal, or has to oppose that. There is no half-way house between the two, in my opinion. If they accept that as the goal, they have to change the entire angle of vision from which they approached this question previously. I, therefore, want the Honourable Member in charge of Railways not to throw at us hereafter extracts from the Public Service Commission or other Commissions showing what the rate of Indianization should be. The demand today is that the entire Indian administration has got to be Indianized, and the European element must be dispensed with.

If the Government of India work up to that policy, they have then to consider what is the period of time they have got before they can fully work up to that solution. If the answer is that they mean to carry out that policy, then they have only to fix the period within which that must be worked up to. It is no use telling people now that we will gradually work up to that. That kind of vagueness cannot satisfy anybody. I therefore want, in the first place to bring to the notice of the Honourable Member in charge of Railways that he should appreciate correctly the spirit and the motive which lie behind the amendment moved by my friend, Mr. Abdul Quyum. Sir, is it not a matter of disgracefulness that in India we should be discussing the question of "Indianisation"? Does any country ever discuss that? Is it possible for us to imagine that in England there can be any question of discussion of Anglicization of the services there? The British people have now ruled over us for 150 years and more, and still the question has to be discussed on the floor of this House that the services should be Indianized,—and they patronisingly reply, "Government thoroughly appreciate this point of view, Government are at one with the people on this point, every attempt is strenuously being made in order to see that the policy of Indianization is being gradually carried out." Sir, that sort of reply we have listened to for long, but how long are we going to put up with that state of affairs? I, therefore, think in connection with the motion which my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Quyum, has moved with a view to the complete Indianization of the railway services, that Government should take pains to understand, from the big movement that is being carried on, what they want, and what are the forces that are working in this country during the last ten or fifteen years.



[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

And what is the object for which all these sacrifices are being made in this country? If the Government has really understood the real significance of all these forces up to this time, I believe they should be prepared by this time to consider at least the question of the Indianisation from a different point of view altogether. In order that they should consider the question from that point of view, it becomes necessary for us to bring in this motion every year. We know as much as my Honourable friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, knows that, unless there is a sanction behind it, it is not likely that our demand will be carried out. But a promise is now being held out and the matter can be decided even by negotiation. We are giving you an opportunity for the solution of this question by moving these motions here. My friend, Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, is there and my friend, Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, is there and the solution of the problem of sanction can be found in a moment if both of them realise that the negotiations are to end in disaster and something serious will have to be done later on. Our efforts for bringing about the necessary sanction by establishing the unity between different kinds of people can be simultaneously carried out along with the placing of a demand before this House. There is nothing inconsistent in it. My friend need not be afraid of recording his vote on this motion and his colleagues also may not be afraid of recording their votes on this motion because we have not yet come to any understanding. If there is a genuine desire that we should work together, we must begin to work together without any understanding and the very fact that we can work together like that will bring about an understanding that is so much desired. If we work simultaneously together, it will create a spirit of real understanding in a much better way than if we go on talking of understanding and understanding every day. If you talk of understanding every day, the talk will remain and the understanding will never come at all. But, if you brush aside the consideration of understanding and come together and work together, you will find that an understanding will be created and it is bound to come into existence. I am sure my Honourable friends on the right will approach each other and understand each other in that way. If they do so, we will bring about a sure unity amongst ourselves if not today then tomorrow. We can then insist upon the Government to listen to our demand and tell them even in the form of an ultimatum as it were—accept this or be prepared. Sir, with these words, I support the current motion.

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan** (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I whole-heartedly support the views which have been put by Mr. Abdul Qayyum so far as the policy which ought to be followed by the Government in respect of the Indianisation of the services is concerned. I wholly share his sentiments and his feelings as an Indian and I do not think that there will be anybody in India who can call himself an Indian who will not agree with the sentiments which have been expressed by Mr. Abdul Qayyum. My difficulty in supporting his motion is that I do not agree with the wording of it. I have been a member of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways for several years which is really a Committee of the House. The policy which we have tried to impress upon the Railway Department has been that whenever we have granted our sanction for any new post, we have insisted that it must go to an Indian if a suitable Indian can be found, and we have always tried to find out at the next

meeting of the Committee whether our policy has been really followed or not. This policy had been going on for many years in the past. Now, as I said, I do not agree with the words of the cut motion. The words are

*"To discuss the failure of the authorities to completely Indianise the railway services and the Railway Board"*

I do not know what the Honourable Member means by completely Indianising the railway services and the Railway Board. In what period does he want the railway services to be Indianised? If he insists on the fact why the Railway Board has not been manned by Indians during the last two or three years, then I do not agree with him because his proposition is not really practical. If he had laid down that in future the policy of Indianisation should be pursued, then I would have whole-heartedly supported him. The fact of the matter is that in spite of our efforts to press the Government year after year that the Railway Board should be Indianised, the fact remains that the Railway Board consists of some specialists who must be on the Railway Board to give their advice. After all, the question of the Indianisation was started not very long ago and we know that our junior Indian officers under different railway administrations are finding their places all right according to their status and grades. In course of time, when they become senior enough, they will be able to take up the Membership of the Railway Board, if in the meantime the Railway Board is not replaced by the Federal Railway Authority. My experience during the last 17 years during which period I have been a Member of this Assembly has been that there has been a great deal of change in the personnel of the officers in the Railway Board's office and it is not right and proper to say that there has been no change. There has been a definite policy to take at least one Indian as a Member of the Railway Board out of four.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga** (*Guntur cum Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural*). There is none now.

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan:** I agree that there is none now and I wish to press on the Honourable Member in charge of Communications that the Indians do really feel that there is no Indian on the Railway Board at present, although, when we sanctioned another post for the Railway Board in 1931, a clear understanding was given to this House that that post will always go to an Indian. Then, later on we found that the Financial Commissioner was an Indian. Now, we find that there is not one single Indian on the Railway Board. This feeling must be in the minds of all Indians in the country as to why the old policy which was laid down in 1931, has been changed and why no Indian has found a place on the Railway Board.

I find there are several senior officers in the Railway department, but no Indian has been appointed as an Agent till now. I suppose one Indian was appointed some time ago as Agent of a railway, but he too retired. I submit there are many capable senior officers who could be appointed as Agents in charge of railways. I think the policy ought to be that senior members of the staff should be given some kind of training and they should be given a chance to hold the responsible post of Agents. I do not for one moment suggest that senior members should be superseded by junior members, I do not suggest that an Indian, because he is an Indian, should

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

supersede senior European officers who have been long enough in the service. I think it is the general policy that in the matter of selection grade jobs, they do not generally go by seniority but by merit. I submit that if an effort is made, it will not be difficult to find a suitable Indian to occupy a high job. I do not want that any hardship should be caused to European members. At the same time the Government should guard themselves against the accusation according to an Indian proverb:

*'Andha bāntē nām aur apne apne ko de.'*

"When a blind man distributes sweets, he gives only to the nearer relations."

This should not be the policy of the Government in their administration and in the distribution of their patronage. If the jobs in the selection grade happen to be monopolised only by Europeans, and if no Indian holds such high posts, then it certainly causes a good deal of excitement in the country. I agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, who laid great emphasis on the point that the future policy should be that all posts should be occupied by Indians. That should be the ultimate goal. Complete Indianisation should be aimed at within the shortest period of time. If Indians could be found in suitable numbers with the required qualifications to fill a certain kind of post, then recruitment to such posts from the ranks of Europeans should be stopped. But I must not be understood to say that the present people who are in the services should be turned out in order to make room for Indians. I do not agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum, when he says that because there is so much unemployment in the country that you should turn out all men who are faithfully serving already in the departments and replace them by Indians. If he means that all the Europeans who are senior should be replaced by Indians, I do not agree with him. If he means that young people with the requisite qualifications should in future be recruited to the bottom of the service, I wholeheartedly agree with him. Indian railways ought to be reserved for Indians and in exceptional cases only should Europeans be recruited. I submit that is the policy which I always advocated in the past. I hope the Honourable Member in charge of the Department will not disagree with me on this point. With these remarks, I submit that although I am sorry I cannot support the wording of the cut motion, and thus censure the Government, yet I support the spirit which underlies the cut motion.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi** (Dacca cum Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I do not agree with my Leader. . . . .

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan:** May I just explain, Sir, that the views which I expressed are my personal views.

**Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi:** We are not here to quarrel about the wording. My Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Qayyum, belongs to the Congress Party and naturally he wants the whole of the railways and the Railway Board to be Indianised. I want Indianisation gradually. That is the difference. But, Sir, what is the position today? Is the Railway Board being gradually Indianised? Far from it. The Government are not doing that. That is the trouble. When Sir George Rainy came before

this House for the sanction of an additional Member's post on the Railway Board, he gave us distinctly to understand that this additional Member of the Railway Board would be an Indian. It was only on that undertaking that we sanctioned the post of an additional Member. What do we find today? Instead of Indianisation, it is Britishisation. That is the policy that the Government are pursuing. Not a single Agent is an Indian throughout the entire railway system in India. There was one formerly. But he retired long ago. When an Indian is about to retire on pension, when there are just a few months more for his retirement, such an Indian is appointed as Agent. This is merely to demonstrate the incompetency of the Indian because he cannot possibly justify his appointment. cannot be expected either to lay down any policy or do something striking within such a short period as a few months. Sir, during the discussion on the Railway Budget in 1936-37 in the Council of State, the Honourable Member in charge of Railways made the following statement which appears on page 99 of the Council of State Debates, Vol. I, dated 20th February, 1936. Referring to the question put by a Member as to why there was no Indian Agent on any State railway, he stated:—

"The Honourable Member is no doubt aware that one Indian Agent has only lately retired."

I may say that was Mr. Singh of the E. B. Railway. The Honourable the Railway Member went on to add:

"Another Indian Agent would no doubt be appointed as soon as a vacancy occurs, for which the most suitable selection would be that of an Indian officer."

I want the Honourable Member for Railways and Communications to take note of this statement made by his predecessor in the Council of State. Let him now appoint an Indian as Agent. There are three vacancies shortly coming in. Sir, I understand that the Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway is retiring in January, 1939; I also understand that the Agent of the East Indian Railway is going on long leave. I am also told that Sir Guthrie Russell is going on long leave and the Agent of the G. I. P. Railway will officiate for him. Therefore, I say that three vacancies are shortly falling vacant, and the Communications Member has to implement the undertaking given by his predecessor in the Council of State. We are told, Sir, that efficient Indian officers are not available and therefore there is difficulty in giving these appointments to Indians. When efficient Indian officers are available, the answer is that there can be no supersession, although day in and day out we find supersessions to be the order of the day. I will not give specific instances of which there is plenty where there has been supersession. They say that efficiency is the first test and therefore an efficient officer always supersedes somebody else. But in the case of Indian officers the plea is always brought forward that there can be no supersession. Not so in the case of Europeans; they supersede and I can quote definite instance where supersession has been going on from year's end to year's end. I can quote chapter and verse to show that even in the Railway Board there is supersession. Therefore, Sir, I welcome this motion which has given me an opportunity of bringing forward before the House this point of view that there is no Indian Agent now and there are these three vacancies in front of us. We hope and trust that the Communications Member will take note of this and will appoint, if not three Indians in the three vacancies, at any rate as many as he can.

**Several Honourable Members:** The question may now be put.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the question may now be put."

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart** (Member for Railways and Communications): Sir, as all Honourable Members are aware because of the fact that this question has been debated so often on the floor of this House, the policy of the Government of India in respect of Indianisation was that which was adopted in 1925-26. That policy was that recruitment for the future should be as regards 75 per cent Indian and as regards 25 per cent non-Indian. I do not know whether any one cares to dispute that so far as that policy is concerned it has been faithfully followed. (*Several Honourable Members:* "No.") You can study the statistics that are given in our report and if you want more figures you can have them. In 1924-25, there were 320 superior Indian officers; in 1936-37, this was increased to 510,—an increase of 190. Simultaneously, there had been a decrease of 257 European officers. During the seven years ending the 31st March, 1937, recruitment to the superior services was 157 officers of whom 88 were Europeans and 119 Indians, the percentage of Europeans and Indians being 24·2 and 75·8 respectively. I could go on quoting figures quite a long while but I do realise that there is nothing to be gained by it, because after all the Mover of this motion, though he himself quoted figures, relied to a much greater extent on sentiment, and figures are of little avail against that. But he urged that recruitment should be as to 100 per cent Indians. Now in view of the fact that the annual recruitment of Europeans is something like three per year to the superior service, I do not think that he would be content with these extra three posts. It was quite evident from what he said that he was not interested in recruitment at all unless he believed that direct recruitment was being made to the higher posts of the service which, of course, it is not. So really what he was after was an immediate demotion of so many European officers who are at the head of the service and their replacement immediately by Indian officers.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** No, that was not the position.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That was my deduction from what the Honourable the Mover said. Now, Sir, it is, if you like, an accident of the history of railways in India that there are at the top at the present moment a preponderance of European officers. The fact is that in the early days and until comparatively recently European officers were the only officers who were then qualified for railway work, but that situation is changing and changing rapidly. We all very readily admit it and we welcome it. But at the same time it must be realised that this position results from the history of the railway services in India. That being the case, is it seriously proposed that there should be undertaken some process that will involve the repudiation of the explicit or the implicit terms of the contracts of those officers who are now serving in the higher posts in the Indian railways? I should be very reluctant to believe that any serious proposition is put forward from any part of the House which would be equivalent to the expropriation of the rights of those officers. I am entirely

in agreement with Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan in his view that when appointments have to be made, the claims of any Indian officers with the requisite qualifications should be considered; and indeed that is the practice and has been the practice in the Railway Department for many years. He has asked that the Indian officers who are rising in the service and who are potential incumbents of the higher posts should be given opportunities for training in the higher branches of administration. That, I claim, is being done; at the present time half of our administrative officers in the Railway Board are Indians.

As regards the claim of Indians to become Agents of railways I am going to make no such admission, as Sir Abdul Halim (Ghuznavi) has claimed, was made in the past by my predecessor, Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan. I do not place the same interpretation on Sir Muhammad Zafarullah Khan's words as the Honourable Member has done. But I say nevertheless, that, in making any appointment of Agent or any other higher administrative post, should there be an Indian who has the necessary qualifications, then his claims will be considered equally with those of any other, but I do not agree to any policy which will mean that non-Indian officers are automatically to be excluded from consideration for any posts in future: that is a position to which I shall never agree.

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan:** If there are two officers, one Indian and one non-Indian, preference should be given to the Indian.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I mean nothing of the sort. I mean, Sir, that a judgment will be taken as to who is the better suited for the job. I cannot conceive of a situation arising in which the claims of two officers will be so evenly balanced, and to make any such statement would only create embarrassment for the Honourable Member and for myself in future. But my position is perfectly clear: there is no discrimination, there has been no discrimination in the past (Interruption), and there will be no discrimination in the future either against Indians or against Europeans.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali** (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): May I ask the Honourable Member how he can justify fresh recruitment of even the 25 per cent. from outside at the expense of Indians? What necessity is there to get men from outside, absolutely raw, and train them—who after a time would go back to their own country and leave India absolutely bankrupt? I should like to hear from the Honourable Member the justification for raw recruitment from outside.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** That was a deliberately taken decision of the Government of India in 1925 as a result of the investigations into the structure of the services by the Lee Commission. It was after an examination of the recommendations of that Committee that this decision was taken.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is,

‘That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 100.’

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 12—OPEN LINE WORKS

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Sir, I move

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,83,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the first day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Open Line Works'.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdul Rahim): Motion moved.

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,83,70,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the first day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Open Line Works'.

*Manufacture of Locomotives in India.*

**Mr. K. Santhanam** (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I beg to move.

That the demand under the head 'Open Line Works' be reduced by Rs. 100.

I am making this motion to discuss the question of the manufacture of locomotives in India. I am fully aware that this question has been repeatedly discussed in this Assembly. It was also discussed last year under a cut motion. I hope, Sir, that I shall not repeat the arguments already advanced. I also hope to take a new line and throw fresh light on the situation, and, if the Benches opposite are open to conviction, to convince them that the time has come when this question ought to be seriously tackled. If you take the proceedings of the meetings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways on the 20th and 21st December, 1937, you find:

"The increase of about 17 per cent. in the total amount already approved by the Committee in this respect owing to the increase in market price was viewed by some of the members with grave concern, and they raised the question whether, in view of the present market position, it did not become imperative for Government to reconsider the feasibility of the recommendation made by the Legislative Assembly in their last Delhi Session regarding the manufacture of locomotives in India."

The reason for this recommendation is to be found on page 10. You will find that when the proposals were first presented to the Standing Finance Committee, 10 XD engines for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway were said to cost about Rs. 13 lakhs, but when the proposal came again in December last, the cost became Rs. 17 lakhs. Similarly for 16 Tank engines for the Southern India Railway the cost rose from Rs. 8 to Rs. 13 lakhs. Similarly, for other locomotives. That is to say there was 50 per cent increase in the cost of the locomotives, and the Financial Commissioner told us that the orders would not even be properly executed. We find confirmation of this on page 67 of the Railway Board's Report. Locomotives ordered out were 93 broad-gauge and 47 metre-gauge: but the numbers of locomotives actually placed on the line were only 16 and 21 respectively. Therefore, some of the members of the Standing Finance Committee have put on record that the question of the manufacture of locomotives must be immediately considered. Before I come to establish that locomotives can be manufactured and ought to be manufactured in India, I shall take the arguments of Government for opposing this proposition last year. I shall not take the time of the House by quoting extensively, but in short their argument is contained on page 1035 of the last year's Legislative Assembly Debates, Volume II. The Member then in charge of Railways, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan said:

"The matter has been very thoroughly gone into. I gave details in my speech in 1935. I shall not weary the House with these details again, but the result was

But unless there was a demand on the average of at least 200 locomotives every year, a completely equipped factory could not be put up, and Government would continue to lose heavily on it if the minimum demand could not be guaranteed. An experiment could be started on the basis of a demand of from 50 to 60 locomotives a year, the scope of which could subsequently be expanded if the demand increased, but even that limited demand could not be guaranteed by the railways.

The argument shortly was that for a fully equipped locomotive factory 200 locomotives are necessary, and there is no such demand from Indian railways, and such a demand is not likely to arise in future, and therefore the locomotive factory could not be set up. I shall subsequently show you from extracts from British railways that this demand for 200 locomotives is excessive. Many of the British companies which are having locomotive workshops are not producing 200 locomotives: only the biggest locomotive workshop in Great Britain is producing this 200. But assuming that 200 locomotives are necessary for the efficient running of a workshop, what are the needs of Indian railways? I am giving you facts from the published Report for 1936-37. The number of engines on line at the end of 1936-37 is as follows:

For class I Railways—

Broad-gauge	5 331
Narrow-gauge	2,654
Other gauges and other classes of Railways	578
—	
	8,563 engines.

The life of a locomotive is said to be from 30/40 years, and the Indian railways have taken it for granted that the age of a locomotive is 35 years. It is a simple arithmetical calculation. We have a total of 8,563 locomotives. The average life of a locomotive is 35 years and therefore what is the normal need in a year? It is, I think—Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad may check this calculation if he is present—253 locomotives a year, if the railways are to be normally replenished. I shall come to the extraordinary circumstances under which our actual orders for the last two or three years have been much less than this number. I say that if our railways are to be replenished normally we should require 253 locomotives a year. There is one other factor which is even more important of which I am afraid Sir Muhammad Zafullah was not aware or forgot to consider, and that is that though each locomotive has a life of 35 years, its boiler has to be replaced within between 15 to 20 years that is to say, in addition to 253 locomotives, you want at least 250 boilers also in order to enable the locomotives to run. So, 253 locomotives and 253 additional boilers are the normal annual requirements of Indian railways. You may ask why for the present year the orders are much less. The reason is to be found at page 67 of the Report where it says:

“On the broad gauge 107 locomotives were scrapped during the year, of which 16 were replaced so that the number of locomotives on 31st March 1937, was 91 less than at the beginning of the year.”

Between 1925 and 1931 they purchased too many locomotives because they had plenty of money, they wasted their money in purchasing too many locomotives and when the depression came they found they had to retrench; they found that the locomotives were not properly utilised and that there were too many locomotives remaining idle in the sheds; that the trains could be speeded up and so many other things. The Railway Board took up all these questions and they reduced the number of



Mr K. Santhanam.]

locomotives, they utilised the engines better, they reduced the number waiting at the workshop; and, therefore, for the last four or five years they have been working under abnormal conditions, so much so that they have been scrapping more locomotives than substituting them. As a consequence they have had to place orders only for 40 or 50 locomotives. But these things can last only for a short time—they are temporary conditions. You will find that though only 57 locomotives have been ordered for 1938-39, 162 boilers have had to be replaced, because though you may retrench in the number of locomotives, you cannot get on without replacing the boilers of the locomotives, and, therefore, there can be no reduction in the number of boilers required. After five or six years when this process of retrenchment has gone on you will have to buy the necessary normal quota. By the process of not replacing the locomotives scrapped the average age of the engines is being increased. All who are acquainted with the railways will know what this means. If you postpone purchases today, you will have to buy more than the average number afterwards. If you buy 50 now, instead of 253, you have to buy 300 or more later on; and, therefore, even if you start a locomotive manufacturing workshop today, it will take five or six years or even ten years to become complete and to enable it to make 150 or 200 locomotives. By the time the workshop is ready, you will be requiring much more than the 200 locomotives which Sir Muhammad Zafrullah said would be necessary for starting locomotive manufacture. Not only this, but 200 boilers also at least will be required per year. (Interruption.) My friend says "What about new lines?" I am talking only of the existing lines and not of any new additions that may be made.

Now, I shall tell you what is happening in the British Railways . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can resume his speech after lunch.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock

---

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

---

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Sir, in my speech this morning I made out that the normal requirement of the Indian railways is in the neighbourhood of 250 locomotives and an additional 250 boilers per year. Even allowing for certain improvements in speed, size, etc., of the engines, I am sure that it cannot be disputed that the normal requirements are well above 200 locomotives and also additionally 200 boilers per year. If you will look at the Railway Board's Report for 1936-37, you will find on page 69 a graphic representation of what I have said. In the year 1928-29, for instance, they have bought in the neighbourhood of 130 broad gauge engines and 110 metre gauge engines. They went on buying many more in 1929-30, and afterwards they reduced and finally stopped purchasing the engines for 3 years. As I have already said they have been getting very few now, and they have also actually been scrapping their engines

This improvement will go on for the next three or four years, but they will again have to go in for more engines in a few years. Some of the engines are beginning to get over-aged, and the position is rapidly deteriorating, and therefore, we shall soon be coming to the stage of normal requirements requiring more than 200 locomotives and 200 boilers per year. They will have to buy more in a short time, because they cannot escape it, and, therefore, we should get ready for that eventuality.

Then, Sir, I want to make out that the requirement of 200 locomotives is an extravagant requirement, which does not happen in other parts of the world. I have taken an extract from a book which deals with the railways of the world,—it is written by Ernest Protheroe,—and it says this:

"All the principal companies (British, and not a few of the smaller, ones, construct their own locomotives, carriages and wagons, and most of the remainder at least effect repairs and renewals, in their own workshops."

Then I take the biggest railway workshop in Great Britain, and this is what it says:

"The London and North Western Railway Locomotive Works at Crewe are the largest in the Kingdom. The ground upon which the Works stand is about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles long and its area is 137 acres, of which 45 are covered in. In this huge industrial hive employment is given to about 10,000 men, to whom may be added over 700 drivers, firemen and others at the steam sheds at Crewe Station, which is the most important junction on the London and North Western system."

This workshop is turning out about 200 locomotives a year.

Now, I shall give the House the size of the London and North Western Railway:

"The total length of line owned by the company is 1,737 miles to which must be added lines partly owned, leased or rented or worked, making a total of 1,966 miles."

Now, Sir, if you will please look at our Report, you will find that all the railway lines, except the A. B. Railway, have got more than this mileage, and still this railway has got the biggest workshop. If you build a workshop as big as the workshop of the London and North Western Railway, it will give us just half of our requirements, and therefore we shall require two workshops of that size to answer our requirements. In fact, there is room for a first class workshop for the broad gauge and a first class workshop for the metre gauge railways and therefore there is no point in saying that there are not enough orders even to keep one workshop going.

Again, I shall take the other point,—can we manufacture these locomotives in our workshops? Is there sufficient technical knowledge or ability in this country? As a matter of fact, there is a locomotive workshop in Ajmer. The B., B. and C. I. Railway own a workshop in Ajmer, but curiously enough no detailed report is given in this volume about the work done there. This year actually a proposal was put forward to manufacture 12 tank engines in that workshop, and then the question arose why were not all metre gauge locomotives manufactured in that workshop? We were told that there is an Act of Parliament which prevents the Ajmer workshop from manufacturing M. G. engines, and when the iniquity of this Act was pointed out, the Chairman of the Railway Standing Finance Committee, Mr. Staig, kindly undertook to see that this Act was repealed. I do not know at what stage that attempt to

[Mr. J. D. Boyle.]

if any one train passes over it, it does not require the same number of locomotives as a 500 miles line over which 50 trains pass every day. I think that argument does not carry much weight.

There is no doubt at all that if private enterprise was to undertake the manufacture of locomotives it would require heavy protection or some form of subsidy and the Indian Tariff Commission of 1924 definitely found themselves unable to recommend the grant of any such protection. In fact, it would have been impossible for them to do so and still keep within the main principles of the Indian Fiscal Commission report on which we are all agreed. Even in the case of the manufacture of individual parts of a locomotive—namely, the boiler, it has been suggested several times that if we could not manufacture whole locomotives in India at any rate boilers might be made.

Now, boilers are made of a special kind of steel, as any engineer will tell you, and it is impossible for that steel to be produced in India at this moment. Even Messrs. Tata, with all the improvements that they have made and the expansion that they have made, would be unable to produce that material. To the extent of something like 90 per cent. of the material that will be used in the manufacture of boilers, the material would have to be imported from abroad. That would, therefore, completely knock out the argument of self-sufficiency in India and the workshop would be in the nature of an assembling shop, and not a manufacturing plant. I think I have dealt with the individual point raised but I would urge before I sit down that Honourable Members when they make this demand should confine themselves to the commercial issue only. If there is a commercial case, that is one thing. If there is no commercial case, then I do not think there is a case for pressing the matter further. Every country in Europe and indeed in the world is showing on its face the pains of economic nationalism. Those pains are not clear on the face of India and it is up to us to see that they do not appear.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** (Nominated Non-Official) Sir, I listened very attentively to the speech on the motion that has been moved by my friend, Mr. Santhanam, and also to the speech that has been just delivered by Mr. Boyle. This subject has been before the House on many previous occasions and each time I took part in the debate, firstly, because I whole-heartedly support it and secondly, because I think the time has come, indeed has long past, when India should be allowed to develop her own resources and be in a position to be self-sufficient and self-supporting in all her industries. When that wonderful day comes, when India will have dominion status, we want to be in a position to supply all our needs, particularly the needs of our vast system of railway administration, of the value of about 800 crores.

When this subject was discussed on the floor of the House last year, the Honourable the Railway Member replied it was an uneconomic problem for India to develop her own locomotives and he persuaded me he was right. But as I listened to my friend, Mr. Santhanam, and the telling figures he gave to the House, he has converted me to his beliefs and demands. His figures appear very convincing that India can manufacture her own locomotives—at least—should be given a chance to do so. My friend, Mr. Boyle, has just referred to the business and practical aspects of manufacturing locomotives in this country, and detailed the difficulty, indeed

the impossibility, owing to inferior steel, of making boilers in this country. We are here discussing locomotives as a whole, not boilers as a part. We have no desire to emulate what has been done in the past and is being done today at Ajmer where they assemble parts of metre gauge engines and place them out on the rail. That is only piecemeal construction or rather assemblage of parts.

Today we want this House, in no uncertain terms, to resolve that the time has come when India must be allowed to make her own locomotives. Sir, we have read a lot about an excess of locomotives in recent reports—the Pope Report, the report on job analysis, the report on standardisation of parts, and last, but not least, the Wedgewood Report, which admits that as far as locomotives are concerned railways have, in the past, been run on lines of extreme extravagance. The G. I. P. Administration boasts of the fact that it has reduced its locomotives by nearly 50 per cent. and says that it has economised tremendously in consequence—40 per cent., which the Wedgewood Report also did, that partly because of the East Indian Railway was, in a measure, responsible for that terrible tragedy, the Bilta accident. What are the facts? The Bilta locomotive workshop was deficient in engines by thirty-three and a third per cent. and an XB-16—engine had to be sent to work the wrong train,—and the House knows the fate of that train. Of course, I know that this matter is *sub-judice* which precludes me from saying anything more. The practical question is, will our railways need annually a sufficient number of locomotives—which will entitle this House to vote in favour of this motion?

Sir, the Mover of this motion has proved that the statement made by the Railway Member last year that two hundred locomotives would be needed annually to render it an economical undertaking is a myth and that possibly fifty to sixty would be the minimum required to make such an institution economical. I would ask the Honourable the Communications Member to consider, when he recasts his estimates and his annual requirements of the number of locomotives, whether India can supply them or not, if given an opportunity to do so. We have for years made this demand and it has for years been put aside on the excuse of it being very expensive and uneconomical. The last Railway Member said that the cost would be about eighty lakhs. Now what is that sum to India when we have crores of rupees at the disposal of the Railway Board? What is eighty lakhs to initiate an industry for which India has for years been crying, and which India should have and must have? (Hear, hear.) Should India continue in the future as in the past and present to be the milch-cow of industrialists and engine-makers abroad? I readily admit that in the past the import of locomotives from England was a vital necessity because we had no proper materials and we had not the proper skilled labour and factories in this country. But is it to prevent the Railway Board from bringing skilled labour out to India to teach us how to make suitable steel and our own locomotives? To my mind there is nothing except a continuance of foreign industrial monopolisation.

Sir, I say a beginning should be made at once whatever it costs, on course, within a reasonable limit. This House must be prepared to foot the bill if India is to be given the chance now to manufacture its own locomotives and other mechanical needs. (Hear, hear.) In the past,

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Hickey.]  
 what has been the practice? The Railway Board calls for tenders and various firms in England respond. I regret to say that even retired Members of the Railway Board have become representatives of locomotive manufacturers in England and Europe and have come out to this country to secure orders. I do not refer to this with any feelings of hostility; I admit it was necessary in the past. I say it was necessary, in the conditions then prevailing, and India had to be the milch-cow of industrialists abroad so far as locomotives were concerned. But should it any longer continue to be that? Certainly not. Times have changed. Just a few years ago hundreds of thousands of pound worth of locomotives were imported from foreign countries, Germany, etc., and today we are told, every time this motion is presented to this House, that it is uneconomic, it is too expensive, and so on. I ask, is it not expensive to import locomotives from abroad? If so, why cannot that money be spent in this country? Why should we spend our money to afford employment to other countries when India's unemployed need it much more. It is no use saying it is uneconomical, that it cannot be done; it can be done, and it should. I say, be done and done at once—no further delays should be tolerated. (Hear, hear.) The excuses of the past have been played out. I consider the time has come when India should be self-supporting. It is no use saying "we cannot do it". We can do it. Send your skilled men and trainers to us from abroad to teach us how to do it; we are willing to learn; I am sure this House is willing to pay for it. (Hear, hear.) But do make a start, and do not deprive us of the means of becoming self-supporting and do not put off that day any longer. It is no use your pinning your entire faith in what the Pope Committee or what the Wedgewood Committee have said. I know, at least I believe I am correct in saying, the Railway Board has not accepted the Wedgewood Report in its entirety. Sir, what the Wedgewood Report told us is really of very little value today. Government brought out railway experts from other countries but they were ignorant of the needs and aspirations of this country. I for one, with certain reservations, condemn most of that report. I am not an engineer, nor am I skilled in locomotives, but I have mixed with railway people for many years and I understand some aspects of railway locomotives, above all else I am a true son and citizen of India and I want to see her advance industrially and come into her own. I have no hesitation in saying that the Wedgewood Committee's conclusion regarding locomotives are not borne out by practical experience. If you want to know the truth don't ask the Railway Board, go to the horse's mouth, the engine driver, who will tell you if locomotives can and should be made in this country. He knows and will tell you the grave dangers attached to reducing the numbers of locomotives and pooling system now in vogue. The Communications Member, I know has the greatest sympathy with the aspirations of this House and of India and I am sure he will not refuse to offer some support to this resolution. I do not expect it to be done in a day or in a year, but what I do ask the Honourable Member is to give us evidence of his intention to make a beginning,—and not to put off for tomorrow what should be done today, believing, as I do in an effort of my own:

"Only the new days are our own.  
 Today is ours—today alone,  
 Tomorrow we may never see,  
 And yesterday has gone."

Sir, I support the motion. (Hear, hear.)

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** Sir, on the issue involved in the cut motion which has just been moved I am glad that a member of the European Group has put forward the views—I presume of that Party—which he has put forward and I am really amazed at the attitude that they have taken up except on what might appear to be a very uncharitable consideration to which I shall come later on. Sir, ever since I joined this Assembly I have attempted to bring up this proposition before this House in various ways: and merely because it is being brought up every year, the argument appears to be ‘some day you will get tired and give it up’. Well, I may inform my Honourable friends opposite that that is a state of mind which is going to cost them more than what they think it will. It is a state of mind, it is not a mere matter of course, we sit here as the tax-payers’ representatives, so that it is not enough that we go through with this as a mere debate. Let them take account of that. ‘They have done it for some time, they might do it again, but next time it may be too late’. When we tell them what we want, we know what we want and it is no use telling us every day that it is up to them to decide. If you continue to adopt that attitude, you will soon find yourself in another place. That is the position which I wish to make quite clear because very often these cut motions are treated as if they did not matter, as if it was a mere matter of vote without view. Whether we have that vote or not, remember that the expression of the views of this House demands their fulfilment and not merely their recording, because, so far as I can see, that has hitherto been the policy of those who sit on the other side. It is with that feeling and with a certain amount of emotional feeling, if you must feel it that way, that I begin to realise that you are moving so slow in responding to the opinions of this House that you ought to begin to consider yourselves and your own position. I remember last time when this question came up, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan got up and said that the Federal Railway Authority is coming up. I believe that Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan will not be here when the Federal Railway Authority does come but that was the only excuse he made for not making a beginning.

But, now let me give you a few facts since, at all events, 1934. The first time that we brought this matter in this House was in March 1935 in the shape of questions and I will read out to you what Mr. P. R. Rau, who was allowed to speak in the name of Government, said. The questions were about locomotives, where they are manufactured, and the percentage of requirements and so on. These questions and answers will show the state of mind of the Government and the manner in which they make promises which are never carried out. I am reading from the Assembly Debates of 1935, Volume II, page 1879:

“Mr. M. S. Aney: Was not such an investigation made with regard to the possibility of having a locomotive workshop in India some years ago?”

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not aware that any complete investigation was made some years ago, but this investigation started only recently.”

Then, I asked the next questions:

“Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Are there any physical difficulties in the way of such a factory or workshop being set up in India?”

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Are there any economic difficulties?”

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes; and that is what the Government are trying to find out whether it is likely to be remunerative.

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai : Is that all?

Mr. P. R. Rau : Yes, Sir.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai : And what had they hitherto been of opinion

Mr. P. R. Rau : That point has not been considered yet.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai : It was never considered in the past?

Mr. P. R. Rau : Not that I am aware of.

And, let me point out to you that since the year 1921 several times it began with a committee of Government pointing out the possibility, almost the necessity, of setting up a workshop on this purpose followed by the report of the Tariff Board of which only half is quoted by the Honourable Mr. Boyle. The report started by saying that it is one of the essential industries which must be set up in this country. If you, therefore, accept that report, remember the first part and do not merely quote the second part.

Mr. J. D. Boyle : I quoted the result.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai : That is not the result. The result is what my Honourable friend pointed out as if he or his country did us a favour that during the last 15 years we have been able to manufacture 90 per cent. of our steel requirements, that we are practically producing all the cement that we want, that we are producing the textile which is a sore point with my friends, so far as such is concerned, as he said, even produce to the point of an over-production. But we owe no thanks to you for all that has been done. I only want to point out that in 15 years' time by reason of the pressure of the public opinion in this country and the policy of the discriminating protection we have been able to make this much progress. I would have liked Sir James Grigg to be here as he also butted in on the last occasion when the question of the locomotives workshop came up. I have read his speech with great interest and I am going to refer to it in a moment. It was only after the policy of discrimination was in our favour once in a way that India was able to make those strides of progress in that industry. May I ask why in this small matter of locomotives you must stand where you do stand?

To continue the questions which I asked and what the people on the other side had to say in the year 1935. I want to find out whether during those three years that have elapsed their minds have moved at all or whether as soon as they go out of this House they say : "It does not matter; the vote was cast but the laugh will soon be on the other side." The following more questions were asked :

Mr. M. S. Anney : Is it not a fact that the workshop which was a locomotive workshop was taken charge of and then turned into a wagon factory?

Mr. P. R. Rau : To the best of my recollection, I think no locomotives were ever built in the Penninsular Locomotive Workshop. It was originally started for that purpose, but they were not built.

Mr. T. S. Arumashilingam Chettiar : May I know, Sir, if the manufacture of metre gauge locomotives has been profitable?

Mr. P. R. Rau : The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway think that on the whole they have been able to manufacture the locomotive as cheap if not cheaper than by importation from abroad.

Mr. T. S. Arumashilingam Chettiar : Then, will not the manufacture of broad gauge locomotives be as profitable if they are manufactured in India?

Mr. P. R. Rau : The whole point is that we are not conducting an investigation ... "

That is what happened soon after I joined this Assembly. I am amazed to find that although since then a Resolution was carried and a cut motion was also carried last year in this House, nothing has been done in this direction. If this is the way in which, notwithstanding the limited time that we have at our disposal and notwithstanding the fact that we are careful to select only those items for which we think our Executive are responsible, if I may so venture to call this irresponsible Executive because they have the spending of our money, they are going to respect our opinions, then I think the day of reckoning is not very far off. The way in which Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan dealt with this question was somewhat on the same lines as those taken by Mr. Boyle, who said, "it is not a commercial proposition".

I think Mr. Boyle is young enough not to know that the railways were not built for purposes essentially commercial, they were built for military and political purposes. The largest number of railways were built in this country soon after the Mutiny and at a cost three times what they would have ordinarily cost but for the fact that they had the desire to complete their railway system within a limited amount of time so that their troops could move freely in this country. So, do not talk of any more methods of investigation to us, we know it better. We know how this 800 crores debt has been piled up on the shoulders of this country. But the fact still remains that there is another and a larger consideration which even from the economic point of view they can take up if they so choose. Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan had the temerity to get up before the House and say: "Oh, it will cost about 80 lakhs of rupees to set up a workshop, and he gave an illustration. He said that a boiler is quoted by the foreigner at Rs. 20,000 whereas it will be manufactured in this country, according to the estimates given to him, at a cost of Rs. 23,000. And then he comes out and says: "Oh, this is 16 per cent. more," the usual method that is followed in telling us about the progress of the Indianization of the army, a wretched word that I do not like. He says, there were five last year, we have made 10 now and so this is a progress of 100 per cent. I say, please treat us with a little more seriousness when you bring forward arguments of this nature. The fact remains that if you add a crore of capital to the 800 crores of debt which we already owe, it is nothing. Is that the method of telling me that this particular bit is unremunerative? Do my Honourable friends go home every day and say, "I am now taking tea, this is a little bit unremunerative and so I will put in a spoon less of tea." Does my Honourable friend come at the end of the day or at the end of the year his bill on food? I think the manner in which this House has been treated has gone beyond a joke. Supposing it was a question of a crore, I will assume that against myself, though most of these estimates are exaggerated, the fact remains that even then at the end of a year's time, it will be a loss. Even if it was a loss of four lakhs by way of interest, out of some 200 lakhs, what would it be on 1-2 per cent. dividend which my Honourable friends were talking of in this great report? I read this report or speeches delivered in this House or in the other House with great interest though it was stated in my absence. I should like to point out from that very report one or two things. You are very anxious to congratulate us and the country on the self-sufficiency it is acquiring—after all it is forced down your throat and you cannot help it, and it is high time that you began to recognise that a little bit in advance. This is what the Honourable the Railway Member



[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

says in page 4 of his Budget speech :

"Honourable Members will, I am sure, be glad to know that the structure has been built of Indian steel, fabricated in India to standards of accuracy comparable with those in any other part of the world."

I am very happy to know it, only I knew it many many years ago. The fact is you would not learn it earlier. This is not the way governments are run. You keep quiet until people wake up to their rights and protest against the manner in which their money is being spent.

I also read with great interest about something which was recited in another place by Sir Guthrie Russell. This is what he says on page 10 of his Budget speech :

"I believe I am correct in saying that this is the largest bridge opened in the Empire during the Coronation year. It was built almost entirely from Indian material with Indian labour and it is a proof that India with her vast resources is rapidly becoming self-supporting so far as works of this description are concerned."

I hope we shall soon be self-supporting in the matter of our Government itself. That seems to be the only cure for the manner in which we are being treated every day and the manner in which our money is being spent every day.

Now, Sir, I will read to you something much more telling and much more informative. On the occasion on which this matter was brought up, the Honourable Sir James Grigg said: "I want to butt in though this is not my subject". I will tell you why he butted in. Indeed, he says "There are two grounds on which we will support any industry in this country in the matter of protection". Well, I said: "This is very kind of you". Then he proceeded to lay down the principles in the usual airy manner in which it is partly abuse, partly argument and partly wrong statement. The statement that he made was this: firstly, it must be essential for the country and secondly, that we can economically afford it. I do not think he threw very much light on this very important issue. What actually happened, I should like to show from one or two quotations.

In answer to a question put by my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, in 1934 when we were comfortably otherwise lodged, this is what he was told in this House :

"We cannot control our railways unless we have the manufacture and building of all the wagons carriages and industry in this country. Today we have to spend hundreds of thousands of pounds in indenting from foreign countries including Germany for the supply of locomotives."

Sir Leslie Hudson, whose absence I very much regret now said this in reference to the same matter :

"We are looking forward to the time,"—*I hope you will not look forward too far,—*"when India will be able to manufacture these things for herself."

If I may draw a lesson from the very same facts given by Mr. Boyle, I draw the contrary lesson exactly. He wants to congratulate us on having done so much now. On the contrary, I say we ought to have done this much at least fifty years ago. It is time that we did it tomorrow and in the language of my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, do it today. That is the only way in which the matter could be tackled and must be

tackled. This is what Sir Leslie Hudson said on that occasion.

"We are looking forward to the time when India will be able to manufacture most of these things for herself. There seems to be no very strong reasons why skilled mechanics should not be brought out from England to teach our artisans how to construct locomotives in this country."

He said that in 1935. We are now in 1938. I am quite sure that if Japan which has none of the minerals necessary for this purpose is able to manufacture everything she wants and indeed sell it to England, if Japan could do that, then surely India, with her vast resources, with her large amount of potential skill and wealth should be able to do that with greater ease. Remember that in future manual labour and manual skill is going to be the basis of national education and we cannot have it told us that we must depend on other countries for our locomotives and that we must continue to incur this great loss that Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan in a spacious argument put forward. If you spend all that money here and employ our own men, it means a great deal more than mere employment for the labourers, it means a saving of four lakhs by way of interest and it means certainly a great deal more in raising the morale of the country and in training skilled workers for the industries of the country so as to make it better. We have been kept down long enough. Allow me to tell you, Sir, that this motion we have selected not as a matter of entertainment, not as a matter of debate, not even as a matter of oratory but as a matter of being attended to, we have had enough of it during the past fifteen years when we brought these things up. We have been in this House—I mean the Congress Party—since 1935. I have taken the trouble to investigate this matter, whether the estimate of 80 lakhs is exaggerated or not. If the figures are correct, the cost of 20 thousand quoted for a boiler by some, of 23 thousand quoted by some others may surprisingly turn out to be only 19 thousand when manufactured on our own part. When you do not want to manufacture a thing here, you can prepare an estimate suited to you and quote it against us.

Let me say this in conclusion that we have very little time in these debates relatively speaking even to consider these demands—indeed they are demands on our purse. They are not demands which must necessarily be met for all time. When a demand is made, we are in a position to make similar counter demands and when that demand is made, what we ask is this. During the last three or four days, there are a few subjects on which we called your respectful attention as to what sanctions will be urged in order to make India self-supporting. This is a matter on which it is quite unnecessary to dilate. But when it is stated times without number *ad nauseum*, "Oh! you will be self-supporting in course of time", *why not now is the question*. I have the materials, both of men and raw materials in the shape of minerals and also raw materials in the shape of agricultural products. Why have I not become self-sufficient already is the only issue before the House. We are not here to cater for others. We have catered for them long enough. If steel could be manufactured up to a particular standard which is the subject of praise in the two speeches I have quoted, I dare say we can advance a little more and be able to make steel that is required of that quality and that standard for higher and better and more subtle and more skilled forms of industry for which steel is required. We, therefore, do press upon the attention of the Honourable Member in charge of the Department that it is no longer time now merely to say, "Well, I don't call for a vote of the House, it seems to me that the

[Mr. Chulabhai J. Desai.]

House is against me". That is not the issue. It is much more than this. It is a thing which you can do, it is a thing, I hope, the House will say, you must do.

**Babu Rajinath Bajoria** (Marwari Association Indian Commerce): Sir, I rise to support this motion. I think even the Honourable the Communications Member will not object to the principle and the object underlying this motion. The only thing which probably stands in the way of his accepting the motion is the prohibitive cost. The beginning is of course always difficult. When carriages and wagons were first manufactured here the same argument was brought forward. Wagons were formerly imported but now we find that as regards wagons we are self-supporting. We have an Indian company which is able to supply over two thousand wagons per year which is the total requirement of the Indian railways. The same thing obtains as regards carriages; and I am sure that if a start is made as regards the manufacture of locomotives in India, sooner rather than later we will also be self-supporting as regards our locomotives. Mr. Boyle of course knows more about boilers than I do, but even the figures which he gave show that we have been practically making 90 per cent. of our requirements of paper, about all our requirements of sugar and cement, and 90 per cent. of our cloth; and he says that we should cry halt. On the contrary, I think that the figures which he has given us should stimulate us; and if we start with locomotives we will probably in 10 or 15 years' time be able to manufacture the same percentage,—about 80 or 90 per cent.—of locomotives in India. The figures which my Honourable friend, Mr. Santhanam, gave were very convincing and I think it must have convinced every section of this House as to the need for starting the manufacture of locomotives now. It was said that we must have an annual consumption of about 200 locomotives. That is no doubt a big figure but even if we begin to manufacture half of this quantity at present we will be able later on to make all our requirements. I remember,—I speak subject to correction,—that some locomotives of a very heavy nature were imported from abroad and they could not be used in this country on account of their heaviness and the track here would not be able to bear the load. What I propose is that there should be standardisation of locomotives. I am not an engineer and I may be mistaken, but what I suggest as a layman is that there should be standardisation of locomotives,—one standard for broad gauge, one standard for metre gauge and one for narrow gauge,—as standardisation will reduce the cost of the manufacture of locomotives. If we manufacture locomotives we will give employment to several thousands of persons. We will also be giving a great impetus to the development of industries in this country and we will also be doing a great service by starting a key industry in this country. We have also to bear in mind the international situation. If there is any international complication, we do not know where we shall stand as regards the cost of our locomotives. We will have to pay very high prices, and if we begin now to manufacture these locomotives they will be of great help to us in times of war or other crisis. Sir, in the beginning the cost may be a little high but in the end we shall be great gainers. When protective duties were imposed on sugar the price at which foreign sugar was sold here was about 18 or 20 rupees per maund, but by this prohibitive protection the manufacturers here have not taken any great advantage of it and the consumers are now getting

sugar at the rate of Rs. 6 or 7 a maund. The same thing has happened as regards paper, cement and other things. So in my opinion it is now high time that we should begin with the manufacture of locomotives so that we may be self-sufficient in this important respect. Sir I heartily support this motion.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City, Non-Muhammadian Urban). Sir, I should like to say a few words, first, on the constitutional aspect of this matter before us. My Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has alluded to it and I have had occasion to speak on that aspect on more than one occasion before. But, it cannot be repeated too often in this House, so long as we work under the present Constitution. Mr. Desai alluded to the effect of our vote, and he rightly complained, that at least in the opinion of this side of the House that vote was not taken as seriously as it should be by Government. I am not maintaining that that vote is always the correct aspect that people should take; I am not maintaining that this side of the House is infallible. We make mistakes and so do Government; but it is a question of what is the opinion of this side of the House and what weight that opinion should carry with Government under the present Constitution. Now, Sir, on another occasion I had the privilege of pointing out to Government that if they attached no importance to the views of this side of the House there was no object in having this House at all. What was the object of our coming here? What was the object of our expressing our opinions? You might as well not have this Assembly at all; and surely those wise men in England, who brought the present Constitution,—the Montagu-Chelmsford Constitution,—into existence had some object in creating such a House as this. The object was that in all matters in which the peace and tranquillity of the country was not concerned, in all matters in which the financial position of the country was not jeopardised, the opinion of this side of the House should be accepted by Government. The final power was undoubtedly left to Government, but that power should be used only when things really came to a crisis. That, I maintain, was the intention of those who inaugurated this Constitution. Has that ever been carried out by the other side of the House? No. On the most trivial matters, on matters in which the financial position of the country is not concerned, on matters in which law and order is not concerned, Government have refused to carry out the opinion of this side of the House expressed by a majority. Now, Sir, here is one of those questions, that arises again and again, and on which, on merits of course, there may be some argument. The Finance Member, on the last occasion, as my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said, butted in.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** He said it himself.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** He butts in very often, and very often on matters that do not concern him. Well, when he butts in, on occasions which really do not concern him, this side of the House takes no notice of his butting in, as the other side of the House takes no notice of the voting. But since, he happens to be fortunately or unfortunately the Finance Member of this country, we have sometimes to weigh what he has to say. My Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, weighed up what he had to say. On matters which are absolutely essential to the interests of the country, it does not matter how much you lose on a

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:**

commercial undertaking; that is to say, for the Army and manufacture of Aeroplanes and such other requirements for Defence, it does not matter what you spend. Secondly you may go in for Industrialisation, if it pays, or if it has a prospect of paying. These are the two principles he laid down, very sound principles indeed. But, how far have these principles been acted upon by other countries in the world today. Look at Germany, look at Italy. I will not take England. Do they initiate anything merely because it pays them to do so? Does Germany go in for Industrialisation simply because it is a paying concern? Hitler's Government, Fascist Government as it is, encourages Industry even at the cost of the tax-payer. I have seen in Germany, manufacture of articles at dead loss. It may be for the sake of unemployment; it may be to claim that Germany is equal to any other country in the world in respect of manufacture. I have seen, Mr. Deputy President, roads made, the finest that can be produced, at dead loss to the country and to the tax-payer to relieve unemployment. These are things not heard of in this country. If there was a dead loss to relieve unemployment, oh! the budget cannot stand it, and then we are asked to follow sound principles of finance, in these times when we see other countries going ahead.

Now, my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has referred to the manufacture of steel, and he has quoted bits of speeches made quite lately by Members of Government taking credit for the bridges or the bridge that has been made of Indian steel. May I tell the Honourable Member in charge of these financial proposals, that we are discussing, that there was a time in the manufacture of that very steel from which that bridge was made, when the loss was so great, that the Board actually had a proposal before them to shut down the Steel Works. I was then a member of the Board. But what did the Board do? They faced the situation and continued the works, which has enabled my Honourable friend and Sir Guthrie Russell to claim that bridges are made of Indian steel.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sagar** (Law Member): It was all due to you, and not to anybody else.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Not due to me nor certainly due to you. It was due to the patriotism and enterprise of Indians.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Has the Honourable Member forgotten the existence of protective duties on steel?

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** I have not, and I am most grateful to the Government of the day that levied these protective duties.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai:** You should be grateful to us: we paid for it.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** I am grateful to this side of the House who forced these duties down the throat of Government. In those days, I was not a Member of the House, but I have been connected with the Steel Works ever since their foundation, and I know this—I am talking of the days before these protective duties were thought of—that the steel works might have been closed down, had it not been for the patriotism—not of

myself, I do not claim any credit, nor can the Honourable the Law Member claim any credit of all persons in the world—and the risk, that the shareholders ran to see that steel continued to be manufactured in this country to enable Members of Government to claim that bridges are made of Indian steel. What are we asking? We are asking Government to take some risk and face some loss, so that twenty years hence their successors may be able to stand up in this House and say that locomotives are made in India.

Now, we are not looking at this point from the financial point of view. This side of the House is not looking at it entirely from the financial point of view. We are looking at it from the point of view of the progress of Industry in India. Who are the largest consumers of railway engines? Government themselves; and therefore we consider, or at least I consider, that it is the duty of Government to encourage this Industry, the production of which, they are the entire consumers. There are private railways too. Is it too much to ask that Government, notwithstanding their conviction, their *bona fide* conviction, that this Industry should not be helped by them, should bow to the opinion of this side of the House and incur a loss, whatever that loss may be, and throw the responsibility for that loss on this side of the House? That is the spirit of the Constitution under which we work, as I understand it: that is the spirit: it is not the letter; you can stand on the letter of the Constitution. It may be a loss of a crore, or of many crores, if the enterprise fails; it may be that there may be continued loss. All right. Let this side of the House take the responsibility, and you make the attempt. We have been for a number of years appealing to Government to make the attempt. Do not let us have figures quoted to us of boilers; they may be bought at Rs. 20,000 from Germany, and cost us Rs. 23,000 to manufacture in this country. Why, if you take the figures today, you may find them totally different. A boiler in 1935 would have cost Rs. 23,000; made today, it would cost Rs. 46,000,—it possibly does: I am certain it has gone up by more than 50 per cent. And from your greater knowledge you may be able to tell us that if an attempt was made to manufacture boilers today in India, it would cost us Rs. 50,000: that may be so, but considering the position in which . . . .

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has got one minute more.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** The only question to consider is, whether Government shall bear this loss, take this risk on the authority and responsibility of this side of the House and follow the example of several countries in Europe whose Governments have taken the risk, who have borne the loss and in many cases who have faced complete and absolute failure without a murmur. (*An Honourable Member:* "Only to succeed later on.") As my Honourable friend says, only to succeed later on. But it may be even to face complete and absolute failure; but if you have the authority, as you have to make this experiment, I can see no reason, constitutional or otherwise, for your refusing to do so. If my time is up, Sir, I have nothing further to say than that my Party will support this motion.

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** Sir, the question as regards the opening of an Indian locomotive factory is one of the old questions that have been debated on

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

the floor of the House very often. There was a time when Government itself was thinking of starting a factory like that, but somehow or other the idea was abandoned and the locomotive factory that was to be was turned into a carriage and wagon factory, and subsequently the question was altogether shelved and now we find the sad necessity of bringing in a motion at the end of every year during the budget discussion and invite the attention of the Government to the necessity of starting a factory like that. One thing always strikes me as very peculiar and it is this. trains have been running in this country for so many years now, but they are propelled by foreign engines. These foreign engines propelling Indian trains and carrying Indian passengers is typical of the entire situation that exists in this country; and, therefore, I feel that this can go away only when this whole picture will be torn up or changed. I feel sometimes like that. They cannot do it unless they stultify themselves: that is how they feel whenever a question like this is put to them . . .

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Indianise the engines!

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** Never mind. As soon as you Indianise these engines every other engine will be Indianised and they shall have nothing to do here. The position is like this. However, the objections that have been seriously urged against this question have been very ably met by my friend, Mr. Santhanam, this evening when he moved his motion: he has made a careful study of the requirements of the Indian railways today, and the very serious objection that is being raised against the idea of starting a locomotive factory is clearly shown by him to be not of a very serious nature at all. He has shown that our average requirement ought not to be less than 200 engines per year; and if that is so, I believe there is substantially no ground even on an economic basis left for the Government to withhold their consent to the proposal for starting a locomotive factory in India.

Secondly, the other point to which my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, drew attention was this: it is not merely a question to be judged simply by a financial test, but it has got a more national object to subserve. Considering the industrial progress of the country which has to be achieved, the establishment of a locomotive factory is an essential thing; and being an industry of such an important nature, in the starting of it mere financial considerations ought not to enter; but the broader questions of making the country industrially self-sufficient ought to weigh with the Government and, therefore, the initial losses which they may have to suffer in undertaking an enterprise of this kind will be legitimate; and when they have got the support of those who are likely to blame them for incurring any losses, then their position in taking up an undertaking of that nature is more than doubly fortified. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, said: "Assuming our calculations are wrong and your calculations about the possible losses are the only accurate calculations, assuming even that position, what is your difficulty? There will be some losses incurred: that is all what you have to say; and who are going to blame you for the loss? And who is ultimately going to bear the burden of the losses also? Those on whom the burden of loss will fall are here through their representatives, calling upon you to undertake this enterprise". Is it not, therefore, proper for the Government to say "All right: we have tried to give you sufficient warning about the possible losses, but in spite of that, if you want us to do it, we are ready to

start and incur the risk"? Even in that spirit the Government can approach this question; and may I say that whenever the Government themselves think of any enterprise like this and come to a decision, do they seriously take the question of profit and loss into consideration? How many of these schemes which they have held out before us and discussed with us in the financial and other committees have really turned out to be as profitable as they were held out to be? I can say from whatever experience I had as a member of the Railway Finance Committee for a number of years, almost every new line that we sanctioned in those days was sanctioned on the basis that it would at least pay not less than 7 per cent. interest ultimately on the capital sunk. I want to know from the Honourable Member which of those lines which we sanctioned between the years 1925 and 1929—after that this new construction programme was practically stopped—are really giving us any interest like 7 per cent. or even 4 per cent. or 3 per cent. So, there is a limit beyond which even the estimates of the Government experts cannot be accepted as correct. Whenever they want to go through with a project they are able to bring us estimates of how much it will cost and how much interest it will pay and so on; but if they do not want it, they can put up an exaggerated estimate before us and say "this is going to be a dead loss". Let them not oppose a thing like this, but let them appoint a committee of non-official experts who can make a serious investigation and find out the possibility of starting a locomotive factory on an economic basis in India. That is all. If the Government is not prepared to accept the proposition that is put before it, they should at least show their earnestness by appointing a committee of non-official experts, men like Sir M. Visveswarayya and others, whose authority in the country will be accepted as of unimpeachable character to see whether it is not possible for the Government to make a good start on an economic basis in the matter of starting a locomotive factory in this country. No such attempt is made. The only thing that is done is to place before us certain calculations made by those whose authority we have to take for granted, and on the basis of those figures, the demand that is being made on the floor of this House from year to year is being rejected.

There was one question which casually was raised when my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, was speaking. When my friend was seriously arguing and telling this House that the steel industry which has received the certificate at the hands of the Government today had to go through a serious crisis, and it has come up to its present position owing to the patriotism of the people, my friend over there got up from his seat and put a question—"Does not the Honourable Member know that the protective duties were imposed after we had sanctioned them"? Yes, they were, and it is known to everybody. But who sanctioned those duties? It is the Members on this side of the House. I was a Member of the House at the time when the Steel Protection Bill was passed by the House, and if we had chosen to oppose that measure, it would not have been passed at all. Now, you can say that Government had brought in a Bill and so on but even that, after how many years? Sir, economists in this country have been crying hoarse to grant protection for a number of years. Since the early days when I was a student, I remember the late Mr. Justice Ranade has been writing and preaching the gospel of protection when the doctrine of free trade was rampant, and even now the free-trader who is sitting here is condemning the limit of the discriminate protection given,



[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

although that protection was granted in a grudging spirit. The Government of India did not want to come out with the protective duties, but certain recommendations were made by the Tariff Board, and, therefore, the Government had to come out with a protection scheme for the sake of the steel industry, which is one of the key industries in this country. We thank our friend for small mercies, even though that protection was granted to us in a grudging spirit, but I do not want that the Government should deny the credit that is due to public opinion in this country on account of which a great impetus has been given to the steel industry by means of protection. The part played by public opinion is as important, if not more important, than the part played by the Government, and, therefore, Government should not grudge the credit that is due to public opinion on that account.

Now, Sir, what does history show? The history of the steel industry should, in my opinion, serve as an eye opener to Government. There are many other industries of this nature which had to be closed in their initial stages through financial losses, and if the steel industry teaches us anything, it is this, that there is justification for the Government to start a locomotive workshop today even assuming that financially it may prove in the initial stages a failure. But that does not mean that a day will not come when India will be self-sufficient in the matter of the locomotive industry also, and thereby there will no longer be any necessity of running Indian trains with foreign engines and even the Indian administration with foreign experts. Sir, with these words, I support the motion.

**Several Honourable Members:** The question be now put.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** If the Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart wants to reply he may do so.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Mr. Deputy President, notwithstanding the turn that the debate has taken in the last hour, I give the Honourable the Mover of this cut the credit of believing that he was in earnest when he endeavoured to demonstrate that the manufacture of locomotives in India was a commercial proposition. He at least recognised that we in the Railway Department have commercial obligations; we have to live up to these obligations that have been laid on us, not by ourselves, but by this Legislature. He said that it was probably useless to go back over the history of the debates that had taken place on this subject, and he refrained from going over the arguments for and against that had been used in the past. I am in agreement with him in that matter. I do not think that any particularly good purpose would be served by having a re-hash of the old debates. He came forward and said that notwithstanding what has happened in the past he could make out a perfectly good case why we should go on with the manufacture of locomotives on a commercial basis, and I propose in the first place to meet him on his own ground. He referred to what the Standing Finance Committee for Railways regarded as an alarming increase in world prices, and he said, "here is our chance to jump in, this gives us an advantage over the outside competitor". But in reality if we buy our raw material,—steel,—in India, are we going to get it so very much below the general level of steel prices in the world? The Honourable Member will find that the Indian Steel Industry is perfectly alive to its own interests, and that

when there is a rise in steel prices externally, there is a sympathetic rise in India. That I think would be found to be the case. Then again, so far as the manufacture of engines is concerned, we are by no means self-sufficing in respect of raw material. As regards the boiler alone, at least 95 per cent of the material, in value, has to be imported. So I think that the first argument is not a very strong one, and we would not really save on the raw material head . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali** (Delhi: General). We will keep the money in our own country.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** The Honourable Member then proceeded to an arithmetical calculation and, as arithmetic, I have got nothing to find fault with it. He reckoned that there would be,—I think it was something like 250 locomotives,—to be built each year and 250 boilers in addition. Now, the average purchase of engines for the past 9 years has been 27 B. G. and 33 M. G. engines . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** From 1926-27 it has . . .

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** If the Honourable Member would only wait a little he will hear what I have to say. I am prepared to agree that there have been signs of traffic improvement that may call for further rolling stock. At the same time, there has been going on for some time, and the process will be continued, the process of the more economical utilisation of our locomotives. As has been said before, there is also a tendency to replace the ordinary locomotive by other types of locomotive, and at the present time I venture to think that the locomotive situation is quite obscure and that it is impossible to say at the present time that we will require anything like 250 locomotives per year. The probable figure will be certainly much less than half of that . . . .

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Do you contend that it will be so after 15 years?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I have done a certain amount of looking forward, and looking forward as far as 1955, our estimates of boilers in those years are 22 broad gauge and 29 metre gauge. It is a very risky thing making estimates as far as that but with long lived machinery like engines one can make a pretty fair estimate of what is going to happen a considerable time ahead and there you have the estimates of the engineers who are concerned with the construction and utilisation of boilers. Their estimate is 22 broad gauge and 29 meter gauge. That is the engineer's estimate.

**Mr. K. Santhanam:** Does it include replacements? We had this year 162 boilers?

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** These are the estimates of the absolute requirements some 15 to 20 years hence. I put it to the House that on the one hand you have the engineer's estimate of 51 as against the Honourable Member's estimate of 250. However impeccable his arithmetic may have been, I myself would come down on the side of the engineer. The Honourable Member supported his case by referring to the London and North Western Railway. It might interest the House to

[Sir Thomas Stewart.]

know that last year the London and North Western Railway bought practically all their requirements of railway engines from outside, namely, some 800 engines. So, as an example, that is not a very good one. It was, however, just at the end of his speech that the Honourable Member suggested that he was not quite sure of his own case, because in concluding he mentioned the word "subsidy" and there I think we have the crux of the whole matter. This is not a straight demand that we should manufacture our locomotives because it would be in the interests of the railways concerned. This, it seems to me, is an introduction by a side door of a new fiscal theory, a new fiscal policy for the Government of India. Well, I leave it to the Honourable Members to consider whether it is an appropriate way of introducing a new fiscal policy, whether in the course of a cut motion when most Members are restricted to 15 minutes there could be adequate discussion of a new fiscal policy for India.

But what is wrong with the existing one? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Independent Party have both acknowledged the benefit that has accrued to India from the policy of discriminating protection and before going any further I should like to make it quite clear that I in my Budget speech and Sir Guthrie Russell in his were making no vainglorious claims in regard to Indian steel and Indian bridge work. We had thought that the Members of this House would be as proud as we are . . . .

**Mr. M. S. Aney:** We are.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** I am glad to hear that. I just wanted to make it clear that I was making no claim. I realise as well as anybody does what has been achieved by the foresight of Indian industrialists so far as steel is concerned, and when I interrupted Sir Cowasji Jehangir, I did so because he had made a statement that Government had in no way assisted in the prosperity of that industry. The Honourable Member quickly corrected himself and admitted the co-operation of Government in granting protective duties. Without the co-operation of Government there would have been no protective duties. The Honourable Member did admit it and there the matter stands.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** May I make a personal explanation? I want to draw attention to the fact that the Steel Industry went through very bad times indeed, faced very big losses before Government thought of assistance. The Steel Industry continued to face losses in the interests of the country. The protective duty came much later. I readily admitted that there was protection but that came at a much later stage. The point I was making was that if private individuals could face the loss in the interests of the country, Government could very well do so too.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Very well then. If discriminating protection has done this for the steel industry and for others, is there any reason why it should not do it for any other promising industry. (*An Honourable Member:* "You are the consumers.") Yes. We are the consumers of 90 per cent. of the rails that are made in Jamshedpur. Do you want us to take over the rolling mills also? (*An Honourable Member:* "Do.") If there is so much public spirit on the other side of

the House, why should that public spirit not be exhibited in building up another great industry. Apparently as far as I can make out, from what has been said, there are great hopes for it and they have got this policy of discriminating protection to rely on, a policy which has proved efficacious in putting on their feet several of our industries. There has however been no suggestion that any interests would take this one up. (*An Honourable Member*: "Will you guarantee orders?") If you can produce the goods at an economic price, we will see about the orders. What has been the case put forward for the change in our fiscal policy? The only argument that has been put forward is that other countries are doing this sort of thing. Well, those other countries have not been doing it for very long and the end is not yet in sight. You may quote to me the economic structure and organisation of the totalitarian States but if there is anything more unstable and more uncertain in the world today than that economic structure and organisation, then I should like to be informed what it is. If you put that forward as an argument in favour of India, the condition of which is at least reasonably stable, if you put that forward as an argument as to why we should embark on any harebrained scheme, not knowing where we are going, then I must differ and we differ now for perhaps the third or the fourth time.

That Sir, brings us to the constitutional position. We must take the Constitution as it is; and as the Constitution stands, it is within the power of the Executive Government to refuse to act upon any recommendation from the other side of the House. Be that a good Constitution or a bad one, we have that power; and so long as, judging each question on its merits, we consider that it will not be for the good of India to act on any such recommendation, then, Sir, we are entirely justified in refusing so to do.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Open Line Works' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 6-F—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF GENERAL DEPARTMENTS.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart** (Member for Railways and Communications): Sir, I move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,87,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments'."

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,87,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments'."

#### *Stores Department.*

**Mr. Manu Subedar** (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Mr. Manu Subedar.]

I do so in order to draw attention to the unwise policy of the Government of India in the Railway Department in the working of the Stores Department and the policy, constitution and activities thereof. Sir, the importance of the subject which I am placing before this House may be judged from the fact that neither the Honourable the Member for Communications nor the Honourable the Chief Commissioner of Railways have made any reference to this subject in their respective sweet speeches in the two Houses, as they should have properly done. Sir, the point which I wish to make is something which would be quite intelligible if I were to speak as from one business man to another, but that is what I cannot do. The Railway Board unfortunately does not consist of business men but of glorified railway services, assisted by *subjantawala* I. C. S. men; I do not say that they have not individual merits or that they are not good men; all I say is that they are not business men. I wish it were possible to speak to them on this subject as from one partner to another but it is not. Our position is what the late Mr. Gokhale said,—that we have got to rub our noses on the glass outside, occasionally making suggestions to you, but, Sir, the time has come when we shall break that glass and we shall enter that arena which you have kept to yourself.

Now, I do not want to keep this House too long at this end of the day with the history of this question. I would briefly recall that there was an Industrial Commission sitting in 1916 which adumbrated various policies including one which said that the purchase of stores by public Departments in India including Railways was one of the most important aspects and one of the most important means of encouraging the growth of industry in this country. As a result of those recommendations there was a Stores Purchase Committee appointed in 1919 and as the result of the recommendations of that Committee, the Indian Stores Department was brought into existence. Sir, in 1924, as the result of public opinion in this country including commercial bodies both European and Indian, a Resolution was moved in this House urging upon Government to secure the inviting of tenders for all purchases of Government in rupees in India. This Resolution was moved by no less a person than the Honourable Mr. Mahomed Ali Jinnah, the Leader of the Independent Party. Many of us had a share in the shaping and suggesting of that policy which it took Government many years to adopt. Sir, though the Resolution was passed by the House in 1924 and though it was accepted, Government took five years to formulate their policy in 1929, and then they said in 1929 that the rules would come into operation in 1931. Since 1931 those rules have been in operation, and while I do not deny that a certain amount of progress has been made, I must state that the progress has been most unsatisfactory. Sir, I accuse the other side in the name of the business community of having been unbusinesslike. Before I made this accusation I was hesitating but after hearing the reply of the Honourable Member for Communications which I consider to be a most unbusinesslike reply, I am convinced that the accusation is absolutely correct. Sir, I gave six years of my life to that trade and I know what I am talking about, and I can dispose of every statement made by the Honourable Member. However, I will do so to the satisfaction of the House some other time.

Now, since that time when the rules have been passed, every other Department of Government has been falling into line with the stores purchase policy, except the Military Department—which I call the untouchable Department—and unfortunately for the Honourable Member for Communications, except the Railway Department. (*The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart*: "Why unfortunately?") My Leader will reply to that. I want to put a few facts before the House with regard to the volume of the purchases that have been going on. Sir, no less than thirty crores rupees worth of stuff is paid for by the Railway Department every year, and out of this the Railway Board themselves decide on a certain amount—about 30 per cent.—and the rest is left to the agents, who purchase through their storekeepers, and about 26 per cent., according to the 1936-37 Report, was purchased through the Indian Stores Department. While the State Railways have been increasing their purchases through the Indian Stores Department, it is unfortunate that the Company-managed Railways omitted to do so for many years until they were probably awakened up at the instance of this House by the Railway Member at that time. Sir, the Indian Company-managed railways have been the greatest sinners in the matter. They still continue to import from the United Kingdom. Now, the point which I wish to lay particularly before this House is that every warning on this subject has been ignored by the Communications Department. They come here, they hear what we have to say, and the reply is either evasive or equivocal. I see a shaking of the head but I feel that that is the fact. Now, I want to quote to the House from a Committee which had been appointed by this House to go into railway retrenchment in 1931, a committee of which the Honourable Sir Ziauddin Ahmad was amongst others a member. That Committee said:

"Both the Chief Commissioner and the Financial Commissioner of Railways agree that when, with regard to any class of stores, they were convinced that it would be advantageous to the States as a whole to purchase through the Indian Stores Department, they would consider handing over the purchase to them and not look to the interests of railways alone."

They further went on to say:

"We observed a flaw in the present procedure for considering price preferences to indigenous material since powers have not been delegated to Agents of railway, by the Government of India."

They recommended:

"The railways should report periodically to the Railway Board all cases where the Agent has without a reference to them decided to place orders for foreign material, because in his opinion the disparity in price was too high. We also recommend, that with a view to facilitate the active compliance by Agents with the policy of the Government in this regard, powers may be delegated to Agents authorising them to give price preferences to a limited extent, etc."

Now, Sir, these two recommendations were made and I want the Honourable Member for Communications to assure this House that these recommendations have been carried out. My information is that these recommendations have not been carried out. Sir, the fact that these recommendations have not been carried is unfortunately borne out by the same Wedgwood Committee report behind which the Railway Members

[Mr. Manu Subedar.]

take shelter when it suits them, a report which they also repudiate when it does not suit them. I am reading from the Wedgwood Committee Report, page 54, where it is said:

"The purchase of other stores is divided on no very clear principle between the Indian Stores Department and the individual railway administrations."

They go on to say further:

"We see no good reason for perpetuating a duplicate system of purchase for the major stores, which should be bought in the cheapest market with a reasonable leaning in favour of the indigenous commodity."

The specific recommendation which they made is contained in these words:

"The purchase of railway stores through the department should be gradually extended; at the same time the function of the Stores Superintendent on the individual administrations should cease by degrees to be that of a purchaser of stores and should be approximated gradually to that of a storekeeper."

Now, Sir, these are clear recommendations that the purchase by individual administrations should cease. There were specific promises made to this effect but these recommendations have not been carried out. In the paper which has been circulated to us with regard to the action taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Wedgwood Committee I find no reference whatsoever to these recommendations. Paragraph 87, in which the first part of what I read is contained, is omitted altogether. With regard to paragraph 88 on which the railways have something to show, it is merely mentioned that a few more items have been added to the list to be purchased by the Stores Department and to be taken away from the list which was purchased by the Stores Superintendent of individual railways. Now, Sir, the point which I wish the Honourable Members of this House to bear in mind is that in what is technically called as stores, which is not a figure covering the whole of the purchases of the railways, no less than five crores of rupees worth of material is still imported from abroad. This figure has varied from year to year but this is a huge figure. The purchasing power to the extent of five crores of rupees is something which, if it were wisely used, could result in the establishment of many industries. It could result in the establishment of industries which would give freight to the railways and which would give livelihood to the people, including my Muslim friends. I say that the Railway Department has failed signally to encourage the industries for those things which they have been purchasing in the past. The Stores Department cannot do so because they are the Stores Department. I have great personal regard for the Chief Controller of Stores who is working at present. But I know that it is the railways that have been evading co-operation with the Stores Department year in and year out. The Stores Department was established in 1923 and still we have the deplorable story of a large percentage of the total volume of imported material being imported directly. We have behind this the mystery that the Government of India will not abolish the Stores Branch of the High Commissioner's Office. This House has asked for it again and again. We were told that the Chief Controller of Stores was examining the question. He took up the examination more than five years ago. He has not yet completed the examination because probably he was preoccupied with several things, or is it that you suppressed his report? I want to know. Then, Sir, there

is still the purchase made by the individual Superintendent of individual railways which amounts to 44 per cent. of the total. I say this is contrary to the recommendations of the Wedgwood Committee Report which you yourself have quoted when it has suited you. This is one of the things which you have omitted to mention in that fat book in which you are giving a long account of what you propose to do with regard to the Wedgwood Committee report. I say this is a specific recommendation whose mention was omitted. You have omitted all mention of the stores in your speeches and generally it seems to us that you are carrying on this matter in the most unsatisfactory and unbusiness-like manner. I fear that the people opposite will never acquire efficiency in this particular line. I know what I am talking about as I have been purchasing stores for my industries all my life. I know something of what I am talking about so far as the Railway Department is concerned as I had the misfortune in the locomotive industry to wait on them and to worm out everything that was inside there, and I say it is rotten to the core. You will never be efficient so long as you are not responsible to this side.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

Now, with regard to the Company railways there is one more point before I conclude. For a long time we were told that the contracts with the Companies did not permit the Government to ask the Company-managed railways to buy in India through the Indian Stores Department or to give a price preference. The question of price preference is one which is real with us. It was real with the Stores Department in 1921 and since then throughout this period in the working of the Indian Stores Department it is real matter with us. We say that where there is a struggling industry which is producing a suitable article which can be of use and which they cannot sell at the same price at which an imported article can be sold, you must give it help for a little while. But it is this specific thing which you have evaded. You have evaded this in spite of the fact that what was meant to be a Retrenchment Committee of this House in 1931 specifically made a recommendation to you that the question of price preference should be attended to, that powers should be delegated to the Agents, that the Agents should be encouraged to give price preference and that a report should be called whenever the Agents have failed to give price preference. I ask again—has that been done?

In the speech of the Honourable Sir Guthrie Russell, I find mention made that the standardisation office—which they have set up at very great cost to the taxpayer—has resulted in industrial advancement to this country. Sir, in the year of grace, 1938, this claim is being made by the railway when they have treated solemn pledges as scraps of paper, when they have broken all promises made, when they have broken assurances over and over again. This matter, that the material required by the railway should be manufactured in this country was gone through in the Railway Finance Committee and in the Railway Industries Committee in 1919 and 1922 respectively. What they have done on the question of locomotives is a glaring example of broken promises. Now, the Chief Commissioner, Railways comes along and thinks that the popular side will be won over by the mere mention of any advance in industry, anyhow and



[Mr. Manu Subedar.]

anywhere. He says that standardisation is good because it leads to advancement. I am sure that we shall all accept standardisation as a good thing, if it does actually lead to that advancement in industry which is alleged by the Chief Commissioner. But let us see whether there is real advancement. On the part of the railways there is unfortunately too much talk about advancement in industry. We have demonstrated over and over again and we shall continue to do so, that they have been the greatest block to the advancement of industry in this country. I say once again that Government have not heeded to most of our requests, they have broken all promises, they have frustrated most of our desires. I accuse the Government in the name of the business community in not having done the right thing by the country. The Honourable Member for Railways made a claim at the end of his speech for "solid advancement". Whatever other advances there may be, I say that in the direction of stores purchase and in the policy thereof in the personnel of this department and generally in the administration, the Government have signally failed.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** Sir, I rise to support this motion. Sir, from the Report of the Railway Board on the Indian Railways for 1936-37, we find that the Company-managed railways have treated the Indian merchants and Indian industries in a much worse way than the State-managed railways. I will just give a few figures. I will not bother the House very long. I am giving the figures from Vol. I of this Report on Railways by Railway Board, page 17. The State-managed railways imported direct stores of the value of only five lakhs in 1936-37, whereas the Company-managed railways imported direct goods of the value of 118 lakhs. This is surely detrimental to the business interests of India. When the State-managed railways are purchasing even foreign manufactured goods in India through the Indian business houses, I do not see any reason why Company-managed railways, if they had the will to do so, could not have done likewise. In my opinion, they are definitely doing this to serve the British interests in England.

Another point is about the purchase of goods of Indian manufacture. Here also what we find is that in 1936-37, the State-managed railways bought Indian goods about 67 per cent. of their total requirements, whereas the Company-managed railways bought goods only 58 per cent. and there also they were about 20 per cent. of 67 per cent. below the State-managed railways. There also they have given undue preference to foreign goods.

The third thing which is also very important is about the stores purchase policy which the Company-managed railways particularly follow. They are not using the agency of the Indian Stores Department at all practically. From 1931-32 to 1935-36, they were barely purchasing one per cent. only of their total requirements through the Indian Stores Department. They were neglecting the very existence of that Department, whereas the State-managed railways were doing much better and they were increasing their purchases from 12 per cent. in 1931-32 to 29 per

cent. in 1935-36. In 1936-37, of course there is some improvement noticeable in purchases through the Indian Stores Department. The Company-managed railways have purchased 5 per cent. whereas the State-managed railways have done 41 per cent. Sir, I think it is high time that the Government of India should force the Company-managed railways to buy all their requirements through the Indian Stores Department. It is a fact acknowledged by the Indian merchants and traders that it is more economical to purchase through the Indian Stores Department, and if the Railways buy through this agency, the Indian Stores Department also will develop the industries of this country, because they give good advice to the traders and thus we are able to manufacture goods to the requirements of the railways in the country.

Now, Sir, with these facts vividly before us when we compare the State-managed railways with Company-managed railways, we find that the State-managed railways are treating the Indian interests as regards their stores purchase much better than Company-managed railways. It has often been said in this House that when the time comes, all the Company-managed railways will be purchased by Government and they will run the railways under State management. I am sorry that though the Government made frequent promises yet they have not fulfilled those promises. When the period of contract for the M. & S. M. railway expired, nothing was done. More recently an opportunity offered itself for taking over the Hardwar-Dehra Dun Railway, South Bihar Railway and some other railway whose name I forget now, but nothing was done. We, on this side of the House, feel that if the railways are run by the State, we have got greater voice in it, we can have greater facilities, we can force the Railway Board to attend to our wants. I, therefore, think that the Government should take these Company-managed railways under their own management as and when their contracts come to an end. I do not know what the policy of the Government is at the present moment, whether they have changed their policy. I should like to have some answer on this point.

As regards stores purchase, I would also request that the railways, both State and Company-managed should use the agency of the Indian Stores Department as much as possible, rather to a very considerable extent; and they should go beyond the Indian Stores Department, only when that department is unable to comply with their requirements. They should also give every preference in purchasing Indian goods through Indian business houses. Sir, with these words, I heartily support the motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Manu Subedar.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das** (Orissa Division · Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I have no time today and I shall not go into general statements on the subject. Standardisation has been referred to and every one knows that standardisation in itself may be good for any other country, but for India it has got practically another name and that is "scandalisation". In the Imperial Conference proceedings our Honourable friends may find that it was conceived and contemplated for British purchases in India and in Colonies as well; and as to the policy of purchase the Imperial Conference from 1923 up to today will give enough material to judge the matter, and I need not go into that. I will go into some details. Let us take Appendix A in the second volume of the Railway Administration Report, 1936-37.

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

Take rails. Tata's make all the rails. I know there was a seven years' contract and whether that contract stands now I do not know. But rails amounting to Rs. 1,34,000 come from abroad; and why? I asked such a question last year. There was practically no purchase of rail from abroad in 1929-30, but it is again being imported. Last year they said that the foreign purchases of rails were 'sorbetic' rails only but later on it was found out on inquiry what this new make-believe "sorbetic" was, and that Tata's could well make those rails. Then steel sleepers. Is there any room for 123 thousand coming from abroad. Why does it come? Some name like 'sorbetic' may of course be invented to justify it, but I know that as the sun rises in the East so all steel sleepers of all kinds can be made by Tata's and other firms like Henry Williams in India. Then comes cast iron sleepers. There is absolutely no reason why they should come from abroad; and even under wooden sleepers you find Rs. 2,000 foreign purchases. Then there was formerly the next item 'chairs and fastenings'. They can be made in India. Now the item is perhaps included in 'P. W. materials',—we cannot now say what these materials exactly are. But a very enormous amount, under this head, about 1/3rd or more than that is from abroad. Then other items, *e.g.*, textile fibre, leather, articles used for finishing railway carriages, interior roofing, floor and sewing materials. In these article too an enormous amount is bought from abroad. Then smaller building material, water mains, sewerage system and track and yard enclosing material and all other parts and fittings,—here again an enormous amount comes from foreign countries. Then the item all leather, canvas, India rubber in bulk and articles made from them which are not included under other heads,—it is practically all from abroad. Apart from all this there is an item of consolidated foreign purchases called "General Purpose Stores" I showed on the debate on Wedgwood Committee that it includes articles like pottery cuttlery, lavatory fittings, etc. I have no time to go into the details of all that and I shall take some other occasion. But the House wants an explanation as to why these things are in a lump granted year after year—for these common articles to be purchased from England; and the amount is not only enormous, but growing every year. This year we have allotted for these purchases an amount of Rs. 135 lakhs. With this money and all these articles to be made with it many provincial industries might have not only been helped but could be started in this country. This policy of purchase should be overhauled, and there should be some non-official committee or something like that to help in the standardisation of materials and their purchase. They should be associated with the Indian Stores purchase of the Railway Board and even the Indian Stores Department to see that Indian industry is not only given an opportunity to thrive but is given regular impetus to make new attempts. Sir, I support the motion.

**The Honourable Sir Thomas Stewart:** Sir, I do not know how far the Honourable the Mover's complaint against the stores purchase policy of the railways arises from his not knowing exactly what that stores purchase is. I shall, therefore, endeavour to tell him, but before doing so, I should like to remind him in answer to his query regarding the fate of the India Store Department in England and that I am not responsible for the Indian Stores Department though I accept, of course, all responsibility for the relations of the Railway Department with the Indian Stores Department

here. The Railway Board in regard to stores purchase follow precisely the policy that was laid down by the Government of India and which was incorporated in the stores rules of 1931. We do realise what the policy of Government is in this connection and that it is up to us to encourage the development of industries by making purchases wherever possibly we can, consistent always with the quality and efficiency of what we buy. As examples of what we are doing let me state the following in regard to certain railway material. Purchases of rails and fishplates, sleepers, locomotives, coaching underframes, goods stock and coal for the State-managed railways are controlled by the Railway Board. Company-managed railways have voluntarily agreed to come into the combined arrangements for purchase of rails and fishplates. So that, so far as the company lines are concerned, we have got them to agree to come in with us on the purchase of these very important standard materials.

Then, the power of giving price preference in favour of indigenous products in order to encourage existing and new industries in India has been retained by the Railway Board and has been used freely. A complaint has been made that we are not very frank about this question of price preference. I think the reason for that is obvious. Once we reveal what we are giving or are prepared to give by way of price preference, then we may be certain that price preference will always be demanded and tenders will be framed accordingly.

As regards other classes of stores manufactured in India, railways are required to submit to the Railway Board quarterly reports detailing with full reasons for their action all cases where they have placed orders for materials of foreign manufacture when tenders were received for the same materials of Indian manufacture. I think that disposes of one question that was put to me by the Honourable the Mover.

The Railway Board is increasing the types and quantity of stores purchased through the Indian Stores Department on behalf of the State-managed railways. The Board meets the Chief Controller, Indian Stores Department, half-yearly to discuss and settle with him new items of railway stores, the purchase of which by State-managed railways through the agency of the Indian Stores Department should be made obligatory. The number of items bought through the Indian Stores Department is increasing year after year. To start off, the Indian Stores Department was not organised to take over the whole of the railway purchases. The Indian Stores Department itself feels that the process of taking over must be a gradual one. But the figures, which are published in the report, do show that there has been a very remarkable increase in the past six or seven years. Whereas in 1931-32 only 12½ per cent. of railway purchases were made through the agency of the Indian Stores Department, the figure has now risen to 41, and the process is going on. In the present year, 1937-38, copies of all Company-managed railways' home indents are being submitted to the Railway Board, and, with the assistance of the Indian Stores Department, are scrutinised, and the railways concerned asked to give Indian manufacturers an opportunity to quote in future for such items in their indents as are manufactured in India. In order to bring more work to Indian firms, Company-managed railways have been given an inducement to buy in India through a system of indemnification. If they pay more for

[Sir Thomas Stewart.]

the Indian article than they would have to do for the imported one, the Railway Board makes good the difference. There are, of course, limits to the amount of indemnification.

May I give the House, Sir, one or two examples in which the Railway Board have contributed towards the welfare of Indian industries. All orders for major bridge work, large bridges, such as the Ava, Willingdon, Broach, Sambhal, Sindh and later the Meghma Bridge, have been placed in India for construction by Indian firms. In 1936-37 we placed with Indian wagon building firms a three year programme of construction. Under the impetus given by standardisation we are now getting practically all our vacuum brake apparatus manufactured in India. There are one or two elements of the apparatus which are not capable of being manufactured in India, but I understand that a factory is being put up in Calcutta to remedy this defect. Permanent way fittings, tract, tools, etc., are now made in India and re-rolling industries have all been fostered by the policy of the Railway Board of making their purchases in India. It is true, Sir, that the Company-managed railways have not responded yet to the same extent as we had hoped they would, but there are signs that their response is growing, and the Railway Board may be relied upon to do everything in their power to induce the Company-managed railways to increase their purchases in India and through the Indian Stores Department.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 6-B—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLY OF LOCOMOTIVE POWER.

*Disregard of certain Recommendations of the Pope Committee.*

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhanmadan): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power' be reduced by Rs. 50,00,000."

My reason for bringing forward this motion is that the Pope Committee's recommendations regarding the intensive use of locomotives, shutting down loco. sheds that are not much in use, have not been taken advantage of. I pointed out the other day that the high price of coal is due to raising more coal out of the railway collieries, and that if Government care to buy their coal from the market there would be good deal of saving. The Pope Committee condemned the use of heavy tractive force locomotives similar to XB engines on F. I. Railway but they are still being used. At the Public Accounts Committee the Chief Commissioner assured that more and more use would be made of light engines: although there would be less speed, there would be greater saving in cost of fuel apart from less wear and tear of the tracts and will result in further economy. When in the Budget I found this aspect had been ignored and the expenditure under the head had been kept at almost the same level as it was last year and

the year previous, it was most surprising. The Honourable Member for Communications is new to the Department and did not spot the assurances that were given by Sir Guthrie Russell in the Public Accounts Committee, and probably not having read the Pope Committee's report he did not know the recommendations made by that report for more intensive use of locomotives. There has been extravagance in use of coal, and extravagance in maintaining large number of locomotive sheds . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Which cut motion is the Honourable Member moving?

**Mr.-B. Das:** No 142 on the List, Sir; under Demand No. 6-B.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). But that Demand has not yet been moved by the Honourable the Railway Member. Order, order.

(It being Five of the Clock.)

#### DEMAND No. 1—RAILWAY BOARD.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs 8,99,800, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Railway Board'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND No. 2—AUDIT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,37,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND No. 3—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,07,900, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND No. 5—PAYMENTS TO INDIAN STATES AND COMPANIES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,31,75,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Payments to Indian States and Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 5-A—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURAL WORKS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,26,25,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works’ ”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 5-B—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE AND SUPPLY OF LOCOMOTIVE POWER.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,86,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 6-C—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF CARRIAGE AND WAGON STOCK.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,74,35,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 6-D —WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF FERRY STEAMERS AND HARBOURS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 6-E—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,89,85,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-F—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF GENERAL  
DEPARTMENTS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 3,86,99,900, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments’.”

The motion was adopted.

◊  
DEMAND No. 6-G—WORKING EXPENSES—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,10,90,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-H—WORKING EXPENSES—ELECTRIC SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,53,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Electric Service Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 7—WORKING EXPENSES—APPROPRIATION TO DEPRECIATION  
FUND.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,57,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 8—INTEREST CHARGES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,63,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of ‘Interest Charges’.”

The motion was adopted.



## DEMAND No 11—NEW CONSTRUCTION.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 54,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'New Construction'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 12—OPEN LINE WORKS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,69,900, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1939, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 25th February, 1938.



Copies of the Debates of the Legislative Assembly and of the Council of State are obtainable on sale from the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi.

